Imprimatur,

Geo. Royſe, *RRmo. in Chriſto Patri, ac Dom. Dom* Johanni, *Archiep.* Cantuar. *à Sacris Domeſt.*

Novemb. 21. 1692.

Imprimatur,

Geo. Royſe, *RRmo. in Chriſto Patri, ac Dom. Dom* Johanni, *Archiep.* Cantuar. *à Sacris Domeſt.*

Novemb. 21. 1692.

AN ANSWER TO THE Brief History OF THE Unitarians, Called also SOCINIANS.

Prov. 18. 17. *He that is first in his own Cause seems just; but his Neighbour comes, and searches him.*

By William Basset, Rector of St. Swithin, London.

London, Printed for John Everingham, at the Star in Ludgate-Street, 1693.

TO THE

Most Reverend Father in God,

JOHN,

By Divine Providence

Lord Archbishop

OF

Canterbury,

Primate of *England*, and Metropolitan, and One of Their Majesties Most Honourable Privy-Council.

IT is the Design of these Papers to baffle and expose those Little Pleas and Objections which the Late Author of the *Socinian* Letters hath

urged against the Divinity of the Son.

My Lord,

This Cauſe doth merit, as well as the Author want your Grace's Patronage; For which Reaſon I humbly preſume to prefix ſo Great a Name, not doubting but they will meet with what Favour they may either deſerve or want. That that God who hath raiſed, would preſerve, guide and ſtrengthen you in thoſe Undertakings which ſo great a Place doth call, and ſo Pious a Mind, more Large and Rich than that Place it ſelf doth diſpoſe you to, for the well-governing the *Church*, and the Uniting us in the True Faith, and in all the Deſigns and Intereſts of Religion, is the earneſt Prayer of

Your Grace's

Moſt Humble Servant,

William Baſſet.

TO THE READER.

When I first met with these Socinian *Letters, and found that words, and fallacy were their whole composition; I could not but think them so unlike their Patrons, or their Patrons so unlike the Character they affect, which is to be men of Wit and Reason, that I Judged them not Worthy an answer. But since it appears that these, like some other the worst things among us, do not want their admirers, I thought this performance my duty.*

In it I have answered not only the first of these letters, but divers parts of the rest, as well as some things in more manly writers, as Eriedinus, Crellius, &c. By calling in the other letters to assist this, and other Socinian *authors, to supply the weakness of them all, I put the Objections, in their full strength, to the end their overthrow may be the more conspicuos to the world, and the more sensible to themselves. If they venture upon*

upon argument, and do any thing, that affects the cauſe, I am ready to ſupport it, But if they only load me with words, and cavils, I muſt neglect them.

If theſe labours are ſucceſful in recovering any, whom this Hereſy hath infected, and in preſerving thoſe, who yet are whole; and hereby in giving any check to the growing errors, and prophaneſs of the age, I ſhall place the time ſpent upon this argument among my happy minutes. That it may be productive of ſuch bleſſed effects, was the hope, and deſign, and ſhall be the prayers of

Yours,

W. B.

AN

AN ANSWER

To the FIRST of the

Four LETTERS,

INTITULED,

A Brief History.

SECT. I.

These Letters are Intituled, A Brief Hiſtory; *yet inſtead of Hiſtory you find little, if any, but an abuſe of divers Authors in the end of the Firſt. A Title as foreign from the Letters, as the Letters from the Truth, that is, neither to the point.*

THat term [*Unitarian*] is put as a diſtinction between them and us: take it as it ſignifies him, who believes one only God, excluſive of all others;

and then it makes a distinction without a difference; for we are as intirely in that Faith, as the *Socinian* can be: but as they make it signify one, who believes the Father only to be God, exclusive of the Son, and the Holy Ghost, I must declare it a term suitable to these Letters, *i. e.* full of *Error*, and *Blasphemy*.

That word [*Socinian*] we leave to the Followers of *Socinus*, who (their beloved *Sandius* saith) differed from all the World; which proclaims those under this denomination, Men of *Novelty* and *Error*.

The Title Page quotes *Act.* 17. 11. *They searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so.*

Answ. St. *Basil* saith of *Eunomius*, *tom.* 1. *l.* 5 Ζητεῖς ἵνα μὴ εὕρῃς· πίστιν, ἀλλ' ἀπιστίαν. *Thou seekest, that thou may'st find, not Faith, but Infidelity; not to discover a Truth, but to establish an Error.* This (I fear) we shall find too true of our *Socinians*, who wrest the Rule of Truth to their own prejudicate Opinions. Sure I am, did men sincerely follow this example, we should find but few of this per-

perſwaſion; ſince their Hereſy is founded not upon Scripture, but upon thoſe falſe Gloſſes, and Sophiſtical Evaſions, which make the Scriptures of none effect.

The Preamble to the Letter pretends, that his Friend demands an account of the *Socinians*. *Their Doctrine concerning God (in which only they differ from other Chriſtians) the* Remonſtrants *profeſſedly agreeing with them in other points of Faith, and Doctrine.*

Anſwer, Their Doctrine concerning God is, That the *Father only is God*; P. 4. But that they differ from other Chriſtians in other points beſide this, is notorious to the world.

They own the *Arians* to be Chriſtians, and *Unitarians*, becauſe they agree with themſelves in this Doctrine; P. 33. But the *Arians* aſcribe to the Son the Creation of the World, while the *Socinians* deny his Exiſtence before the Incarnation: Therefore either the *Arians* are no Chriſtians, or the *Socinians* differ from other Chriſtians in other Doctrines beſides this.

But he would prove that in other points the *Socinians* agree with other Christians, because in other points they agree with the *Remonstrants*: Which implyes,

1. That there is no difference between themselves, and the *Remonstrants*, but this; which is well known to be false, And

2. That themselves, and *Remonstrants* are all the Christians in the World: Because he makes it, that their agreement with these doth prove their agreement with other Christians; but this is false too: Because these *Remonstrants* were condemned by the Synod at *Dort* about the five Propositions.

You have then a double falshood in the compass of this one Parenthesis; the one in inlarging the number of his Friends; the other in lessening the number of his Errors. The design of which must be to perswade the Reader, That there is but one step between the Orthodox Faith, and this Heresy, to the end he may the more easily decoy 'em into it.

Accord-

According to this beginning you must expect but little, if any truth, and honesty in this Letter, which we shall now consider.

SECT. II.

He saith, P. 4. *That --- Christ was a Man, the Son, Prophet, Messenger, Minister, Servant, and Creature of God; not himself God, they think is proved by these (as they call them) Arguments.*

Answer. I Am glad to find any modesty in a *Socinian*, for they [call] them Arguments; and they [think] they prove: But with better assurances we declare they are no Arguments, nor do they prove the point in Controversy: For though they prove that Christ is Man, yet they do not prove he is no more than Man, or is not God. This will easily appear from our Examination of his Arguments themselves, which are these,

Argum. 1. P. 5. *If Christ were himself God, there could be no Person greater than him*: But himself saith, *Joh.* 14. 28. *my Father is greater than I.*

Answ. I deny the Consequence: Because though the Son is less than the Father in some respects, yet he is equal to the Father in others. None of the former do destroy his Divinity, but the letter do prove it. For,

1. The Son is less than the Father, in regard of his Humane Nature, and Offices: But these (we shall prove) are not inconsistent with his Divinity. And,

2. In regard of his Sonship. For the Father is of himself, but the Son is of the Father. Whence *Episcopius* infers a Subordination of Persons, but yet establishes the Doctrine of a Trinity. So the *Nicene* Fathers taught, That the Son is *God of God*, that is, God of, and from the Father; but yet withall asserted, That he is of the same Substance with the Father; and consequently is God as the Father is. And indeed this

this Subordination cannot destroy his Divinity, because it doth not destroy his Nature: For the Inequality arises not from the Essence, but from the order, and manner of subsistence. But,

3. In other respects the Son is equal to the Father; this the Apostle asserts, *Phil.* 2. 6. *Who being in the form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God, viz.* the Father. Now if he thought it no robbery, it could be no robbery; and if no robbery, he must be equal; and if equal, he must be God by Nature, as the Father is.

This leads to the true sence of those words [*Being in the Form of God*] for though μορφὴ, of it self strictly signifies not Substance, so much as Accidents; not so much the Nature, as the Appearance of things; whence *Erasmus*, and the *Socinians*, would have these words to signifie, not that he is God, but that he was like to God. yet however the Apostle must here intend it Substantially: that is, his being in the *Form of God*, must signifie that he is God; as his being in the *Form of a*

Servant, signifies, that he was a Servant: And the Reason is, because his equality with God is here inferred from his being in the *Form of God*; but there cannot be an equality between a thing, and the mere likeness of it; between a real Nature, and a bare similitude. Whence *Erasmus* understood the force of the Word, but not the reach of the Apostle's Argument.

Though *Erasmus* doth not deny the Divinity of the Son, yet because he thinks this Text doth not respect his Nature; I shall therefore oppose to his sence the Judgment of the Ancients; as *Annot. & Serap. contra. l. 2. Novat. de Trin. c. 17. Hilar. Pict. Epist. de Trin. l. 8. & 10. Greg. Nyss. tom. 2 cont. Eunom. Ora. 7. &c.* Which Judgment of theirs I shall confirm by these Arguments; *viz.*

1. By the matter of the Apostle's Argument, he was in the *Form of God*, and in the *Form of a Servant*. If this Text speaks him not God, but like to God; it must also speak him not a Servant, but like to a Servant: But that he was

a

a Servant he ſaith himſelf, *Mat.* 20. 28. *I came to miniſter*; and therefore he muſt be God; becauſe the ſame Phraſe, and Senſe applyed to each Nature, muſt import the reality of the one, as well as of the other.

2. The order of the parts ſpeaks our ſenſe: For *being in the form of God, i. e.* While he was in the form of God, *he took upon him the form of a Servant:* therefore that form was before this. But there was no ſuch difference in the parts of his Life, or Condition upon Earth, that one ſhould merit to be called the *form of God*, the other the *form of a Servant:* Therefore his being in the form of God muſt be antecedent to his humane Life.

3. This was his choice, and voluntary Act, for he *took upon him* the form of a Servant: But he had no liberty of choice in this world; becauſe his condition here was determined and foretold; whence himſelf ſaith, *Luke* 24. 44. *That all things muſt be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of* Moſes, *and in the Prophets, and in the Pſalms, concerning me*; there-

therefore this choice was before this life; and consequently must be the Act of the Divine, not of the Humane Nature. So evidently doth this Text respect the Nature of Christ; and therefore declare him to be equal to God the Father, as being God by Nature, as the Father is.

This Equality our Saviour himself doth prove, *Joh.* 5. 17. *My Father works hitherto, and I work:* whence the *Jews* concluded *v.* 18. that he made himself *equal to God:* Upon which he doth not explain himself, as if they mis-understood him; which he did in the case of *eating his flesh*, and *drinking his blood:* But *v.* 19. he proves this equality, *what things soever the Father doth, these* [τᾶτα] the very same, *the Son doth likewise.* Whence he must be equal to the Father in Operation, and consequently in Power. So *Ambrose de fid. l.* 1. *c.* 13. and *Greg. Naz. Orat.* 36.

Hence he requires *v.* 23. *That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*; which imports an equality of Honour flowing from an equality of Operation;

Operation; for the reaſon of the duty inſtructs us in the nature of the duty it ſelf. This Honour is owing from their works, but they both do the ſame works, therefore they muſt both have the ſame Honour.

Hence *Joh.* 10. 30. *I, and my Father are one*; that is, not in concord only, as the *Socinian* pretends, but in power; Becauſe the context ſpeaks not of Wills and Affections, but of *keeping his ſheep*: *none ſhall pluck them out of my hands*; becauſe *none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hands*; for which he gives this reaſon, *I, and my Father are one*: which muſt be one in power. And if they be one in power, they muſt be one in Nature; unleſs you make an Almighty Creature, which is not only an abſolute contradiction, but alſo confounds the eſſential properties of God, and the Creature; which is a much viler Abſurdity, than they can with any ſhadows of Reaſon pretend againſt our Doctrine.

That gloſs then of *Athanaſius cont. Ari. Orat.* 4. muſt be admitted, *viz.*

This

This shows τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς Θεότητος, καὶ τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς ἐξουσίας, the sameness of the God-head, and the Unity of Power. For indeed the abscribing to the Son the same Infinite Perfections, and the same Honour, but not the same Nature with the Father, as the *Socinian* doth, proclaims not only the perverseness of the Disputant, but the Idolatry of the Professors too.

In that case of his being the *Messias*, he sends Men to his works, whose Nature, and agreeableness to ancient Prophecies, do sufficiently declare the point. So here he first asserts his equality with the Father, then improves it to an Unity in Power, and Honour; and then leaves men to conclude from thence an Unity of Nature. This is the most rational way of teaching; for positive affirmations tell us things *are so*; but Natural, and necessary consequences, such as these are, prove they must be so. Therefore though the Father is greater than the Son, as the Father is of himself, and is God only; while the Son is of the Father, and is both God and Man; yet the

the Son is equal to, nay, *One* with the Father in Operation; and if in Operation, then in Power; and if in Power, then in Nature: and therefore muſt be God.

He proceeds *p.* 5. to manage this Argument from *Joh.* 20. 17. *I aſcend to my God, and your God*; whence he fancies, the Son is not God, becauſe another is his God.

Anſw. As Chriſt is Man, and we his Brethren, ſo our God is his God: This proves that he is Man, but cannot prove, he is not himſelf God, which is the deſign of this Letter. Nay, as the Son is *God of God, i. e.* God the Son of, and from God the Father, ſo the Father may be his God, as well as his Father; without weakning the Doctrine of his Divinity. So far is this Text from concluding his Point, that it makes nothing againſt us.

He adds, *Joh.* 12. 49. *The Father, which ſent me, he gave me a Commandment*: The Argument is, the Son is not God, becauſe the Father commands, and ſends him.

Anſw. This hath been anſwered already.

dy. For in what respects the Father is greater than the Son, in the same respects the Father may command, and send the Son: But as the Father's being greater than the Son, doth not destroy the Divinity of the Son, because (as before) it doth not destroy his Nature; so neither can his commanding and sending him; because this Power flows as a right, or consequence from his Superiority, And if the Father's Superiority it self cannot destroy the Son's Divinity; that Power, which is implyed, or wrapt up in the very Nature of that Superiority, can never do it.

Arg. 2. P. 5, 6. *If Christ were God, he could not be the Creature of God:* But that he is the Creature of God, he would fain prove from two Scriptures; the former is *Heb.* 3. 1, 2. *The High-Priest of our Profession Jesus Christ, who was faithful to him, that appointed him:* In the Greek, and in the Margin it is *faithful to him that made him.*

Answ. The meaning is, that appointed, or made him High Priest, which respects not his *Being*, but the Designation of him

him to that Office. In this ſence we uſe the Phraſe of making a Biſhop. Yet this (it ſeems) is a *Socinian* Creation.

His other Text is, *Coloſ.* 1. 15. which calls him the *First-born of every Creature*: whence he would have him to be but a Creature.

Anſw. He is the First-born of every Creature not in kind as one of them, but in regard of an Exiſtence prior to them: Whence *V.* 17. He was *before all things*. To this agrees that of St. *John Ch.* 1. 1. *In the beginning was the Word*, *i. e.* when all things firſt began, then this *Word*, this firſt-born [was] or did exiſt. And both this Apoſtles and the Evangeliſt with one conſent declare him not a Creature himſelf, but the Maker of all Creatures, for *Coloſ.* 1. 16. *By him were all things created*: And *Joh.* 1. 3. *By him were all things made*. This drives the *Socinian* to three moſt palpable falſhoods, *viz.*

1. Theſe words [*By him were all things created*, *Coloſ.* 1, 16.] are ſpoke (ſay they) not of Chriſt, but of God, *Let.* 4. *P.* 131. *Anſw.*

Answ. They grant us, P. 130. that *V.* 15. which runs thus, *the Image of the Invisible God*, and *the First-Born of every Creature*, is spoke of Christ: And consequently, *V.* 16. must be spoke of him too; because that word [him] by him *were all things created*, cannot possibly have any other Antecedent, than *the Image of the Invisible God, and the First-born of every Creature*; whence immediately follows this, 16 *V. For by him*, i. e. *by this First-born were all things created.*

They would have indeed the [Invisible God] to be the Antecedent, that by him, *viz.* the Father, were all things created. But Sence, Coherence, Grammatical Construction, and other parallel Texts, can never allow this. Because,

1. The subject of that 15th. Verse, is Christ; who is called the Image, and the First-born; but those words [the Invisible God] are but an adjunct, designed only to show us whose Image he is: But now the Relative must respect the Subject, not that, which is but a dependent upon it.

2. These words [the first-born of every

every creature] do follow those words [the invisible God] for the Text runs thus; *The Image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature:* Therefore to these, *viz. the first born* ----- the Relative [him] must immediately refer; that by him, *viz.* Christ, who is this Image, this first-born, were all things created.

Sometimes indeed a Relative may refer to not the next, but a remoter Antecedent: But this is only in two cases: As either for the sake of sence, or for the avoiding that interpretation, which may contradict some other text; but neither of these can be pretended in the case before us. For the sence is as compleat, and natural, as well as the construction more easie, if the Relative refer to the *first-born*, as if it refer to the *invisible God*; and the referring it to this first-born, doth not contradict any text, but concurs with all them, that ascribe creation to the Son. Therefore the *Socinian* can have no other reason for his construction, but only the support of an Heresy.

2. They say, That all things were made not [by] but [for] him.

Answ. This is totally overthrown by St. *John* ch. 1. 3. *By him were all things*

made; *and without him was not any thing made, that was made.* Where observe that the Evangelist doth industriously secure the title of Creator to the Son.

1. By an Universal Affirmative, which includes all things made, in the number of his Creatures, *for by him were all things made.* And,

2. By an Universal Negative, which denys there ever was any creature, which was not created by him; *for without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

No Text saith so much in reference to the Father; therefore they may at least as fairly deny the Father to be Creator, as the Son; and doubtless the design of the Holy Writer is to obviate and expose all Cavils against this Doctrine.

3. They fly to a Metaphorical Creation, that he *did not make*, but *renew all things* after they were made.

Answ. This is impossible: for *Colos.* 1. 16. *By him were all things created, that are in Heaven,--- whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers.* ---By which the *Socinian*, *Let.* 4. P. 133. understands *Angelick Orders*; but the Holy Angels were not renewed, for they kept their Stations, and therefore did

did not want it. And the fallen Angels were denyed it.

The ſame Letter P. 132. ſaith, That all things were *modelled, not created* by him; and P. 133. explains it thus, Chriſt is ſaid to *modell* and *order* all things upon earth, *becauſe of the great change he introduced.* For which ſence he quotes *Camero*, *Piſcator*, *Diodate*, *Dallee*, *Vorſtius*, *Davenant*, and *Grotius*.

Anſw. I can find nothing in *Camero*, *Dallee*, and *Vorſtius*, upon this Text: Had they ſpoke to his purpoſe, I doubt not but he would have given us particular References.

Piſcator ſaith, all things were *per eum condita*, made, or created by him; as the word uſually ſignifies. But for Argument ſake, ſuppoſe it may in a remoter, and looſer ſence ſignifie alſo to *modell* and *order*: Yet let the *Socinian* tell me, what reaſon he hath to tye *Piſcator*'s ſence to theſe, excluſive of that: Since that is the common import of the Word, and is agreeable to the mind of this Author, who, upon all occaſions, aſſerts the Divinity of the Son, and aſcribes to him the creation of the world. For upon theſe words *John* 1. 3. *By him were all things made*; *Piſcator* ſaith, the

Evangeliſt doth here aſſert the Deity of the Son from the effects, or things, that he hath done, *videlicet ex omnium rerum conditarum creatione*, from his creating all things made: where himſelf applies this word [*condita*] to the creation of the World by the Son. Therefore the *Socinian* is falſe, and unjuſt in pretending that this Author underſtands it not of *creation*, but of *modelling*, and *ordering* things.

Diodat is ſo far from the *Socinian* ſence, that upon theſe words he aſſerts the Eternal Generation of the Son, and ſpeaks him with the Father an equal, and co-operating cauſe of all things.

Davenant upon this Text thus, *Chriſtus non eſt creatura, ſed creaturis omnibus prior; quia per ipſum condita ſunt:* Chriſt is no creature, but is before all creatures, becauſe they were all made by him. Where this Author by this word [*condita*] muſt neceſſarily mean a creation properly, becauſe he gives this as a reaſon, why Chriſt is no creature, but is before all creatures, *viz. becauſe he made them all*: But he cannot poſſibly underſtand by it to [model] or [order] becauſe he might model, or order, and yet notwithſtanding be a creature, and after

thoſe

those creatures too. Therefore the *Socinian* doth here pervert the sence of this Author, and also totally ruines that Argument, by which he proves that sence: Which is a crime so false, and malicious, that it can admit no Palliation.

As for *Grotius*, he shows indeed, that the word here rendred to create, doth not always signifie properly to create, but is sometimes applyed to the new creature. We grant it: But by the leave of so great a man, and of this little *Socinian* too; this doth not prove it doth not signifie properly to create, in this text. That it is taken improperly in some places is no Argument that it ought to be improperly in this. Though I shall prove in it's place that *Grotius* was neither *Arian* nor *Socinian*; yet I must say, that he hath not in all places done that justice to this Cause, which he might and ought to have done it.

It is worth our while to observe, that to prove that Christ is a creature, these men will have ברא (which signifies to create, in as large, and loose a sence, as the English word [make] doth; as to make the World, to make a Verse, &c.) to signifie properly to

create in *Heb.* 3. 2. contrary (as we have ſhown) to the evident ſence, and deſign of that place: But to prove he did not make the World, they will have κτίζω, in *Coloſ.* 1. 16. to ſignifie not to create, but to model and order: Though it doth moſt properly ſignify to create, and *V.* 17. by aſcribing to him an Exiſtence prior to all things, ought to lead and determine us to this ſence.

This is plain ſhuffling: And indeed where men will take words of a various ſignification in ſuch a ſenſe as is agreeable to their own Hypotheſis, but not to the ſcope, and deſign of the place, that uſes 'em, they may perplex any truth, and colour over the fouleſt Hereſy in the World; and in fine, turn the whole Scriptures into contradictions, and nonſenſe.

That Chriſt was no creature, I ſhall further prove againſt this Letter, and the *Arian* both, by theſe two ſteps;

1. That he was before all creatures, and
2. That he was from eternity.

1. He aſſerts his own Exiſtence before the world: for *John* 17. 5. *He had Glory with the Father before the world*; and therefore

fore he muſt exiſt before it: for *non entis nulla ſunt prædicata.*

They ſay indeed, this Glory was in decree only, as the Lamb was ſlain from the foundation of the world in decree only: But theſe are not parallel caſes; for then that Lamb could be ſlain no otherwiſe. But the Scriptures do abundantly declare that Chriſt did actually exiſt before the world; and therefore might be actually glorified before it. Neceſſity requires that interpretation as to the Lamb; but there is no ſuch neceſſity in this caſe; and therefore no ſuch interpretation is to be admitted: for we muſt never leave the common, proper, and literal ſence of a Scripture; unleſs it be for the ſake of a concurrence with, or non-contradiction of ſome other Scripture, which is not in this caſe; becauſe no Scripture ſaith, he did not exiſt before the world.

This is a fallacy *à bene conjunctis ad male diviſa:* when Men put ſuch odd conſtructions upon a Text taken by it ſelf, which it abhors, when taken together with others. For, in this caſe, was there no Text but this, which aſcribes to him a Being before the World, their

gloss might [perhaps] seem to have a little colour of probability in it; and that is the most it could then pretend to: But take this Scripture together with those, that declare he did exist, when all things began, *Joh.* 1. 1. That he was before all things, *Colos.* 1. 17. That he *made* and *created* all things *Joh.* 1. 3. *Col.* 1. 16. The case is so plain from the light, which one text gives to another, that a Man would think that none, but the wilfully blind, could mistake it.

If in this manner we follow this, or some other point in controversy between the *Socinian* and our selves from one text to another, till we have laid all those together, which speak to the same point; one would think that either the Scripture is so worded, that it is extreamly apt to lead all plain honest minds into error; or else that the *Socinian* sence is but mere shuffles, and evasions of the truth. One of these must be; Judge, & choose, but consider it is on the part of God, and *Socinus*, who stand here opposed each to other.

Upon this Scripture *Irenæus* in the next age after the Apostles *l.* 4. *c.* 28. Thus, *ante omnem conditionem glorificabat Verbum Patrem suum, & glorificabatur ab eo*: Before

fore

fore every Creature the Word, *i. e.* the Son, did glorifie his Father, and was glorified by him. By which this Father doth speak,

1. His Existence before all Creatures: For every thing did glorifie it's maker so soon as it did exist; but the Son did glorifie his Father before all Creatures, and consequently did exist before them. And,

2. His Divinity. For had *Irenæus* numbred the Son with the Creatures, as the first of them in the *Arian* sence; or as the last of them in the *Socinian*, he must have worded it with some respect to them, as thus, before all [other] Creatures: or the *first of all Creatures*; the Son did glorifie, *&c.* but this form distinguishes him from all Creatures, not as one of them, but as being already distinct from, as well as before them all.

The Son then was before the World, *i.e.* before the Creation, and consequently before all creatures, which was the thing to be proved; whence it follows, that there is no necessity of taking those Texts, which ascribe Creation to him in an improper sense; and if no necessity, they must be taken in a proper one;

be-

because all Scriptures must be taken properly; unless that sense doth contradict some other Scripture; which is not in the case before us, because no Text saith the Son did not, or that the Father only did create the World.

2. Since the Son was before the world, he must be from Eternity; because the Scriptures no where suggest a creation between Eternity and Time: But on the contrary, *Moses* declares that the creation of the World was *the beginning*, *viz.* of the creature, and consequently there could be no creature before it. Whence in the Scripture-Phrase to be in the beginning, that is, before the world; and to be from Eternity, are the same thing. For wisdom doth thus express her Eternal Existence, *Prov.* 8. 22, 23. *He possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was*: and *v.* 24, 25. *when there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no Fountains abounding with water: before the mountains were settled, before the Hills was I brought forth.* Thus to be in the beginning, and to be before the world, are Phrases, which

which the Spirit uſes to expreſs the Eternal exiſtence of wiſdom: but the Son was *in the beginning*, *Joh.* 1. 1. he *was before all things*, *Coloſ.* 1. 17. and before the world, *Joh.* 17. 5. therefore the ſame Phraſes muſt as well expreſs the Eternal exiſtence of the Son too,

If the Son then was any where called a creature, it muſt be reſtrained to his man-hood, as his deſcent from *Abraham* is, *Rom.* 9. 5. it was *κατὰ σάρκα as to the fleſh*: which reſtriction muſt imply that there is ſomething excepted, as to which he is no creature; and as to which he did not deſcend from *Abraham*; which can be no other than the Divine Nature: whence the next words ſay, *he is over all God bleſſed for ever*. *Irenæus* l. 3 c. 18. reads it thus, *Ex quibus Chriſtus ſecundum carnem, qui eſt Deus ſuper omnes benedictus in ſecula.* Of whom Chriſt was according to the Fleſh, who is God over all bleſſed for ever: and *Tert. adv. Prax. c.* 13. thus,--- who is *Deus ſuper omnia benedictus in ævum omne*: God over all bleſſed for ever: which Reading is farther from the *Socinian* Conceit of its being a thanksgiving for Chriſt, Thus, *who is over all God be bleſſed for ever*, than our Tranſlation is. From this

this Text, which the *Socinians* have so miserably disguised, not these Fathers only, but the first Ages of Christianity too, have always pleaded the Divinity of the Son.

He continues his Argument from 1 *Cor.* 3. 32. *Christ is God's*: that is (saith he) God's Subject; and this he fansies must be God's creature.

Answ. Why not God's Son, since the Scriptures so often call him so? but if it must be [God's Subject] yet it can do him no Service: For he is his Subject in regard of his Humane Nature, and Offices: Nay, his Subordination to the Father, as Son; the Apostle (as we shall show) calls a *Subjection*: which will appear to be so far from affecting his Divinity, that it gives light, and strength, to this Doctrine.

He cites *Mat.* 12. 17, 18. *behold my Servant.*

His Argument lyes thus, *p.* 5. *If Christ were God, it could not without blasphemy be (absolutely, and without restriction) affirmed of him, that he is the servant of God.*

Answ. It is not affirmed of him absolutely, and without restriction, but in reference to his Humane Nature, and Offices:

Offices: and till the *Socinian* doth prove that it is abſolutely affirmed of him, *i. e.* that Chriſt is in all reſpects a Servant, and not in ſome only; it hath not ſo much as the face of an Argument.

His next Scripture is *Phil.* 2. 8, 9. *he humbled himſelf, and became obedient to death, therefore God hath highly exalted him.*

Anſw. His obedience to death, doth indeed prove that he is man, for elſe he could not dye: this we all grant: but neither this, nor his Exaltation can ever prove he is not God, which is the thing in controverſie. The truth of this will appear from our explication of his next Scripture, which is,

1 *Cor.* 15. 28. *Then ſhall the ſon alſo be ſubject to him, who put all things under him.* Which ſubjection he conceits deſtroys his Divinity.

Anſ. [Then] ſhall the Son be ſubject; that is, at the end of the world, *v.* 24. which implies that till then he is in ſome reſpect not ſubject; which is a demonſtration of his Divinity. For all creatures are in all points his Subjects; therefore if there is any one reſpect, in which the Son is not ſubject, then the Son muſt be God.

Now his non-ſubjection is this, that now

now he hath a Kingdom, *viz.* The Church given by the Father, in which he reigns himself as Mediator, whence *V.* 25. *He must reign.* This Kingdom the Church is separate from the Dominion of the Father, which is the World: Therefore so far as he reigns in this Kingdom, so far he reigns separate from the Father, and that is *not subject* to him. Hence he saith, *Matt.* 28. 18. *All Power is given me: Phil* 2. 9. *God hath highly exalted him*; and again *Psal.* 2. 9. *I have set my King upon my holy Hill of Sion.* But at the end of the World, *He shall deliver up this Kingdom to the Father, V.* 24. And then he shall reign no otherwise than as subordinate to the Father, as Son; which the Text expresses by [subject to the Father]. Whence it must be granted, that when he saith, the *Father commands and sends me, &c.* These were spoken, and ought to be understood, antecedent to this exaltation.

To close this Argument. On the one hand this exaltation proves no more than this, That the Son hath now a Kingdom, which he had not before; but it doth not prove that he did not reign before with the Father in the Government of the World: And on the other hand, this

this ſubjection proves that the Son ſhall reſign this Kingdom, but it doth not prove, he ſhall not reign with the Father for ever: Becauſe this ſubjection is not a ſubjection of the creature to God, but a ſubordination of one Perſon to another in the Sacred Trinity.

Argum. 3. *P.* 6, 7. The true God is not the Miniſter, or Prieſt of any other. *But Chriſt is the miniſter, and Mediator of God, and Men*; Heb. 8. 6. *He hath obtained a more excellent Miniſtry*: ch. 2. 17. *He is a faithful High-Prieſt.*——

Anſw. Theſe Texts reſpect not his Nature, but his Offices; and therefore do not deny his Divinity. For the ſame Apoſtle applies to him thoſe Scriptures, which can be ſpoke of none but God; as *Pſal.* 45. 6, 7. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever, and ever*: Which *Heb.* 5. 8. declares that God ſpoke of his Son: And *Pſal.* 102. 25. *Thou haſt laid the foundations of the Earth; and the Heavens are the work of thy hands*: This alſo *V.* 10. applies to the Son.

Theſe Texts are ſufficiently vindicated by the learned Dean of St. *Paul's*, Dr. *Sherlock*, who ſhows that this word [God] *Pſal.* 45. 6. is not a Nominative, and therefore is not ſpoke of the

Father

Father, as the *Socinians*, and particularly this Letter from *Enicenus*, would have it; who render it [God is thy Throne] *i. e.* The Father is a Throne to the Son: But it is an Attick Vocative, and consequently can be spoke of no other than the Son, whom it stiles [God] and to whom it ascribes an Everlasting Dominion: As the other Psalm doth the creation of the World. Those very *Socinians*, who have read this answer, do yet still insist upon their own sence, without taking any notice of that answer, which is an evident Argument they do not pursue the discovery of Truth, but only serve their own Hypothesis.

Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. 4. c. 15. argues the same thing from the *Hebrews*, and *Aquila*'s Version. And sure I am that from hence the Apostolick Ages did always assert the Divinity of the Son. Thus *Just. M.* Dial. *Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 7. Orig. cont. Cels. l. 1. Cypr. adv. Juda. &c.* And certainly since each Testament, *viz.* the Old in its Doctrine, and the New in the express application of it to the Son, do jointly proclaim this Minister, this Priest to be God, as well as man, the *Socinian* must be extremely unjust in pleading the one in contradistinction to the other.

He

He insists, *The true God cannot Mediate or Intercede, but Christ Intercedes*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God and Mediator — the Man Christ Jesus.*

They object elsewhere, that Christ the Mediator is here Distinguished from God, *there is one God, and one Mediator*, whence they presume this Mediator cannot be God.

Answ. The Mediator is distinguished from God, not simply, because (as we shall prove) himself is God: But only *secundum quid*, as Mediator; for as such he not only is both God and Man; but also by his Mediatorship stands between both, in order to the reconciling both together; and consequently, must be distinct from both. But that this Mediator is God as well as Man, will appear:

1. From the Sense of Antiquity, and the Judgment of the Church in all Ages, which ever held that the Mediator must be *utriusque particeps*, Partaker of both Natures, that there may be some equality between the Mediator, and the Persons between whom he mediates, to the end he may the more powerfully reconcile both together. Upon which bottom

Irenæus, who was Diſciple to *Polycarp*, as *Polycarp* was to St. *John* the Evangeliſt. *l.* 3. *c.* 20. thus, *adunivit hominem Deo*; whence *Theodoret*, Dialog. 2. ἥνωσεν ... τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ Θεῷ, he hath United Man to God. And,

2. From the Nature of his Mediatory Kingdom, which requires Omnipotence, whereby he may be able to ſupport and govern it: and Omniſcience, whereby he may know all the wants and circumſtances of it. Therefore ſince the Nature of this Kingdom of Chriſt doth requite infinite perfections, which are incompetible to a Creature, it doth evidently declare the Deity of this Mediator; who is accordingly not only ſtiled God, but hath likewiſe the incommunicable Name, *viz. Jehovah*, and Perfections of God aſcribed to him in the Scriptures.

3. The deſign of this Text is not to declare that the Father only is God excluſive of the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt; but to teach us that there is but one God, and one Mediator excluſive of the many Gods, and many Mediators, acknowledged by the Gentiles. But ſtill (notwithſtand-

withſtanding any thing in this Text) this Mediator may be with the Holy Ghoſt One God with the Father. They have therefore brought a Text to diſprove our Doctrine, which neither as to Letter, or deſign, makes any thing againſt us.

But this Letter pleads, that God cannot mediate, but Chriſt doth, therefore Chriſt cannot be God.

Anſw. We grant that God cannot intercede with the Creature, becauſe this would imply that he is neither Almighty, nor All-ſufficient; but the Son may intercede with the Father without bringing his Divinity into queſtion.

Therefore (to put the *Socinian* into a right method of diſpute, which he yet ſeems totally a ſtranger to, there being nothing proper and concluding in all his Arguments) let him prove that in this Text theſe words [One God] are ſpoke excluſive of the Son; and that the Son's Interceſſion with the Father is inconſiſtent with his Divinity: This is to his purpoſe, and muſt be done, or elſe he muſt give up this Text, and indeed his Cauſe together.

His Argument is fallacious; for it applies that to God in reference to the Creature, which we apply to one Person in the God-head in reference to another; and lyes thus, God cannot pray to the Creature, therefore the Son cannot pray to the Father: a *Socinian* Argument indeed, which all men else would be ashamed of.

But it is said [the man Christ Jesus] true, but this is not simply man, but man united to the eternal word, or Son of God. So [the man Jesus Christ] suffered for us; but there was such an Union between the two Natures, that what was suffered by the One, was imputed to the other; whence, *Act.* 20. 28. *We are purchased by the Blood of God*, that is, by the Blood of Christ united to the second Person in the glorious Trinity. This Text *Tertullian ad Uxor. l.* 2. *c.* 3. quotes without any *Anti-Trinitarian* gloss upon it; and indeed these blasphemous Interpretations now in use with these men, were utterly unknown to the Apostolick Ages.

Argum. 4 *p.* 7, 8. *God doth all things in his own Name, and by his own Authority*;

rity; he ever doth his own Will: and ſeeks his own Glory: but Chriſt ſaith, John 17. 28. *I am not come of my ſelf:* John 5. 43. *I am come in my Father's Name:* John 5. 30. *I ſeek not my own Will:* and ch. 8. 50. *I ſeek not my own Glory.*

Anſw. This is true of God in reference to the Creature; but it is not true of one Perſon in the Trinity in reference to another. For though God cannot come in the Name, and by the Authority of a Creature, yet the Son may come in the Name, and by the Authority of the Father: becauſe, though the Son is equal to the Father as God, yet the Father is greater than the Son, as Father. For which reaſon *Epiſcopius*, whom this Letter beſpatters for an *Arian*, *Inſtitut. Theol. l.* 4. *c.* 32. ſaith, That the Son refers all things to the Father, as the Fountain of the Deity; of, and from whom the Son is. By this he rejects a Co-ordination, but aſſerts a Subordination of Perſons in the Trinity: and therefore at the ſame time both ruins theſe Objections, and alſo eſtabliſhes the Doctrine of a Trinity.

He proceeds; God declares himſelf to be the prime object of Faith and Worſhip; but the Son doth not ſo, for *John* 12. 44. *He that believes on me, believes not on me, but on him that ſent me.*

Anſw. Chriſt doth in this very Text propole himſelf as the object of Faith and Worſhip; for he ſaith, *He that believes on me*, which aſſerts that men did believe on him, and implys that they ought to do ſo; what follows is but a qualification of the thing ſuitable to his ſubordination to his Father; for ſuch an one believes *not on me*, that is, ſolely, or ultimately: but *on him that ſent me*, i. e. on him, as well as me; by which he doth not exclude, but include himſelf with the Father, as the object of Faith and Worſhip. This ſenſe muſt be allowed, elſe you run into theſe two abſurdities, *viz.*

1. You make the firſt clauſe aſſert, what the ſecond denyes; and the ſecond deny what the firſt aſſerts, *viz.* That men do believe on him, and yet do not believe on him: they do not believe, and yet they believe ſtill.

2. Theſe

2. Theſe Scriptures, which make Faith in Chriſt a condition of Salvation, ſuch as *John* 3. 36. *He that believes on the Son, hath Everlaſting Life*; muſt be razed out of our Bibles.

But perhaps he may trifle upon that word [prime] object, which hath nothing in it. For if the Father be the prime object as he is the firſt Perſon in the Trinity; yet the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, are the One, and only object in regard of Nature.

But as the Texts, he here quotes, cannot ſerve his Hypotheſis, ſo there is One among them, that totally deſtroys it, *viz.* John 8. 42. *I proceeded forth, and came from God*: that is, I am not from the Earth, but from Heaven: this is the Apoſtles ſenſe, *Epheſ.* 4. 9. *That he aſcended, what is it, but that he deſcended firſt?* Whence he did not firſt aſcend to receive his Doctrine and Authority from God, as *Socinus* dreams; but he firſt deſcended from God, *with whom he was in the beginning*, John 1. 1. and *with whom he was glorified before the World*, John 17. 5. Our ſenſe falls in with variety of Scriptures, which on every ſide

confirm and ſupport it: but theirs labours with endleſs difficulties in wreſting and perverting them; that is an Argument of truth, but this of falſhood.

Argum. 5, *pa.* 9. *God was always moſt wiſe, but Chriſt increaſed in Wiſdom,* Luke 2. 52.

Anſw. The Text ſaith, he increaſed in *Wiſdom* and *Stature*, which word [*Stature*] ſuits not a Divine Nature, but an Human Body, which ſhews that the Text ſpeaks of him, not ſimply, as if in his whole Capacity, without any exception, he increaſed in Wiſdom, but only as Man, and conſequently this Text proves he is Man; but doth not prove he is not God, which is the deſign of this Argument. This is a demonſtration of a ſtudied corruption of the truth; for (like the Devil) he quotes but one part of the Text, to the end he may pervert the whole.

He proceeds, *God was never ignorant of any thing*; but he makes it that Chriſt was ignorant of two:

1. Of the place where *Lazarus* was buried, *John* 11. 34. *Where have ye laid him?*

Anſw.

Anſw. This no more proves that he knew not the place, than Gods asking *Cain*, Gen. 4. 9. *Where is* Abel *thy Brother*, doth prove that God knew not what was become of him? How can we preſume he was ignorant of this, who of himſelf knew both his death, and the time of it too. That he would not in every thing give demonſtrations of his Divinity, is no argument againſt it.

2. He pleads that Chriſt knew not the day of Judgment, for *Mark* 13. 32. *Of that day knows no Man* (in the Greek 'tis [οὐδεὶς] *none knows*) *no not the Angels— neither the Son, but the Father*; St. Matthew, ch. 24. 36. adds, *but the Father only.*

Anſw. He knew it not as Man; but this doth not prove, he is not God, and did not know it as ſuch. For *John* 21.17. *He knew all things*, and therefore muſt know this, or this muſt be nothing. In 1 *King* 8. 39. *God only knows the Hearts of Men*; but *Joh.*2.25. Chriſt *knew what is in Man*: But to know the Hearts of Men, and to know what is in Man, are the ſame in Senſe; therefore Chriſt knows what God only knows; and conſequently

ly Christ must be God, and for that cause Omniscient. *Revel.* 2. 23. *I am he who search the Heart.* This *Let.* 4. *p.* 154. doth acknowledge that Christ spoke of himself. But this (as we know) is proper to God, who alone can search the Heart: Therefore our Savior's Application of it to himself, is a Manifest Assertion of his own Divinity, and consequently of his Omniscience, which is inseparable from the Divine Nature. Whence it must be that he knew it not as Man only, but yet at the same time must know it as God.

But here the *Socinian* pleads, that he knew many things not of himself; but by Communication from the Father, as the Prophets did, 2 *Kings* 8. 12. *I know the Evil thou wilt do to the Children of Israel*: Therefore some extraordinary Knowledges in Christ, do speak his knowledg no more Omniscient and Inherent, than that of the Prophets. So to this purpose *p.* 155.

Answ. These are very unlike Cases. For,

1. This Prophet knew this Man so far as concerned his future Dealing towards this People: But this doth not prove,

prove, that he knew this Man any farther, or any other Man at all. Whereas *Joh.* 2.24. Christ *knew all Men*, and *v.* 25. *He knew what was in Man*; and therefore all that is in Man: Which never was affirmed of any of the Prophets. From which alone it appears, that his Knowledge was much more extensive than any of the Prophets.

2. He knew all things *Joh.* 21. 17. which imports an infinite Knowledge; But an infinite Knowledge can never be Communicated to a finite Understanding: Because there is an infinite Disproportion between the faculty and the object: Therefore the Knowledge which Christ had, speaks him infinite, and that is God.

3. This Hypothesis, *viz.* that such a Knowledge can be Communicated to a Creature, doth confound the Essential properties of God, and the Creature, because it makes the Creature infinite, as well as the Creator, and

4. Our Saviour saith, *Revel.* 2. 23. *I am he who search the Heart*: Which Phrase [search the Heart] was never applyed to any of the Prophets; but only

ly to Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt: Yet he ſaith, not only *I* do it, but *I am he* that do it; which is more Emphatical, and implies, that this is his own Act, and conſequently, that his Knowledge of the Heart, is from his own ſelf. Therefore his Knowledge was not like the Prophets; for their's was Finite, but his Infinite: Their's Communicated, his Inherent.

For which Reaſons, as well as others, Antiquity put that Senſe upon theſe Texts, which might not deny, but eſtabliſh not his Omniſcience only, but ſuch as is not Communicated, but Inherent too: For *Greg. Naz. Ora. 36. Athanaſ. tom. 1. Contr. Ar. Ora. 4. &c.* he knows this day θεικῶς as God: And conſequently muſt know it of himſelf; but he knew it not, ἀνθρωπίνως as Man; hereby making thoſe words [none knows] to exclude not what is God, and therefore not the Son as God; but all the Creatures, and therefore the Son as Man.

In the ſame Senſe muſt we take that of St. *Mathew Ch. 24. 36. of that Day, and Hour, knows no Man, no, not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only.* For here

here [Father] must not be taken personally for the Father, in opposition to the Son, and the Holy Ghost: But essentially for God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in opposition to that word [Man] of that Day and Hour, knows no Man — but the Father only; therefore these words [the Father only] exclude the Son from this Knowledge as Man, but not as God. This exposition is cleared, and confirmed from hence.

1. That in the Scriptures [Father] doth often signifie God essentially, including, Son and Holy Ghost, who are of, and from, the Father.

2. This Sense must be granted, else you make this one Text, to contradict all those which say the Son knows *all things*, &c. and

3. These Exclusive Particles [none] knows, or the Father [only] *i. e.* God [only] knows: Must be so Interpreted in divers places of Scripture, as particularly *Luk.* 10.22. *No Man* [in the Greek it is here also οὐδεὶς none] *knows who the Son is but the Father*, or the Father only. Whence they may as well exclude the Holy Ghost from the Knowledge of the Son,

Son, as the Son from knowing the Day of Judgment; becauſe this Particle [none] muſt be as Excluſive in that Text, as in this. But this Word cannot Exclude the Holy Ghoſt from the knowledge of the Son, becauſe 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. *The Spirit ſearches all things, even the deep things of God*: Which word [ſearch] doth imply, that this Knowledge is perfect, and from himſelf, when applyed to the Spirit, as well as when applyed to the Father in the ſearching the Heart: And conſequently by parity of Reaſon, it cannot Exclude the Son from the Knowledge of that Day.

Therefore when I find theſe Texts cited by the *Socinians*, confineing theſe Knowledges to God; and yet meet with others, which aſcribe infinite Knowledge to the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, I muſt conclude, not that the Son and Holy Ghoſt, are either ignorant of ſome things, for then I muſt contradict thoſe Texts, which ſay they know all things, or that they are Creatures indowed with an infinite Knowledge; becauſe this (as is Diſputed already) is utterly impoſſible: But I muſt conclude they are God;

God; and therefore are not Excluded by thoſe Texts, from knowing thoſe things of themſelves; but are included with the Father in the God-Head; and therefore are with the Father, that One God, to whom all things are open, and naked.

He proceeds, Chriſt aſcribed the Infallibility of his Judgment to the Father, *Joh.* 8. 16. *If I Judge, my Judgment is true; for I am not alone, but I and my Father, that ſent me:* Which he thinks an Argument againſt his Divinity.

Anſw. I am not alone, but I and my Father — that is, the Father hath not left me alone, but bears witneſs to me by Miracles. This ſpeaks not the inſufficiency of his Judgment, but the incredulity of this People, and the abundant means, that he vouchſafed them. Whence he ſo often appeals to his Works *Joh.* 10. 25. *The Works that I do in my Fathers Name, they teſtifie of me,* and v. 38. *though ye believe not me, yet believe the Works.* Therefore this proves the Grace of God the Father, but doth not diſprove the Divinity of the Son.

He inſiſts, God cannot be tempted,

Jam.

Jam. 1. 17. but the Son was Tempted of the Devil.

Anſw. If God cannot be Tempted, what is the meaning of *Mat.* 4. 7. Jeſus ſaid— *thou ſhalt not Tempt the Lord thy God?* St. *James* ſaith, God *cannot be Tempted with, or to evil*: No more was our Bleſſed Saviour, for he complyed not with the Temptation.

He cites *Luke* 18. 19. *Why calleſt thou me Good? There is none good, ſave One, that is God.* On which the Letter ſaith, *he refuſed to be called Good, becauſe God only is Good.*

Anſw. The true meaning is, he refuſed to be called good, unleſs in Relation to his Divinity, implying that himſelf is good, not by Participation, as Man is; but eſſentially as God is: Therefore he asks, *why calleſt thou me good, viz.* as Man, or as God? That ſenſe he Rejects, this he claims as his due. So *Athanaſ. tom.* 1. *de Hum. Nat. Suſcept.* εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρωπάδον νομίζεις με, καὶ ὐ Θεὸν, μὴ με λέγε ἀγαθὸν. If you think me Man, and not God, call me not good. Suppoſe this Text is of it ſelf capable of thoſe two ſenſes, the one of which ſpeaks him

but

but Man, the other God: Wee may eaſily determine which Senſe to take it in; for their's contradicts all thoſe Scriptures, which declare his Divinity: But our's comports with them, without Contradiction to any: Therefore not their's, but our's muſt be admitted, becauſe it muſt be interpreted in concurrence with other Scriptures, but not in contradiction to 'em.

Arg. 6. p. 10. God gives what, and to whom he pleaſes, but Chriſt ſaith, to Sit on my right Hand, and on my left —— is not mine to give, Mat. 20. 23.

Anſw. Is not mine to give, i. e. as Man, *not mine* Excluſive of the Father, or contrary to the Divine Oeconomy, according to which, ſomething is aſcribed as peculiar to every Perſon in the Sacred Trinity. That this is the meaning, is evident from *Joh.* 10. 28. I *give unto them Eternal Life*: Nothing can be greater than this, yet the Son gives this, as well as the Father. Therefore in what Senſe the other is not his to give, in the ſame Senſe Eternal Life is not his to give: But in what Senſe he gives Eternal Life, in the ſame Senſe he gives the other too, whatever you pleaſe to underſtand by it. This they know is our Doctrine, and therefore ought not only to propoſe

this Scripture, but also to prove an inconsistency between this Scripture, and this Doctrine: This he doth not attempt, nor will ever be able to perform. But it seems it is enough for a *Socinian* to start an Error, and then leave it to the World, in hope some may take it, as the Man did the Snake, into their Houses.

He proceeds, God needs no aid of any other; but Christ saith, *he that sent me, is with me.*

Answ. The thing in Controversie is, whether the Son be God, as well as Man: The *Socinian* brings this Text against us; but if we at present only suppose that he is both, which we must do, till it be disproved, he can never tell me, why the Fathers presence with the Human Nature of Christ should necessarily imply a denial of his Divine Nature; and consequently this Text is no due Medium, whence to conclude his point.

He adds, *God cannot Pray for himself, and People, but Christ Prays for himself and Disciples.* Luk. 22.42 Heb. 5.7. *&c.*

Answ. We Teach that Christ is both God and Man: Now he Prayed for himself, only as Man, *Luk.* 22.42 that this Cup, *viz.* his Passion, now at hand, might pass from

from him. He Prayed for others, as Priest, Heb. 5.6. *Thou art a Priest for ever*, whence *v.* 7. in *the days of his Flesh — he offered up Prayers*: Whence the *Socinian* thinks he cannot be God, that is to say, his Praying must hinder the Human Nature from being united to the Divine; for which he can produce neither Scripture nor Reason. Nay, as Man he dyed, yet notwithstanding this was United to the Divinity: And if his Death could not hinder this Union, much less can his Praying.

But to shew the weakness of this Argument, we will add, though he cannot Pray considered Essentially as God; for so there is nothing above him, yet he may Pray considered personally, as the Son of God, *viz.* the Father; for as Son, he is Subordinate to the Father, and consequently as Son may Pray the Father. This is an Argument then no more to his purpose, than if he had told us a Story of *Abraham's* Travels, or *Noah's* Planting a Vinyard.

He urges farther, *Christ Dyed, and the Father raised him from the Dead*, *Ephes.* 1.19,20. Whence also he fancies he cannot be God.

He that dyed, and was raised, must be Man; but his Argument implies, that he who raised him, must be God, which is

enough to our purpose: For he raised himself, *John* 2. 19. *destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up*; which *v.* 21. saith, he spake of the Temple of his Body. Therefore (according to his own Hypothesis) the Son must be God, as well as Man.

But the *Socinian* pretends, Let. 3. p. 89. *That Christ raised his Body by a Power communicated to him by the Father; and accordingly his being raised is always attributed to the Father, not to himself.*

Answ. This is false; for that Text doth attribute it to himself, *I will raise it up.* Therefore either the Son must be the Father; or else his Resurrection is not always attributed to the Father.

2. If he was raised by a power solely from the Father, then he must be raised by the Father: for he raises the dead by whose Power the dead is raised; and consequently he could not say, *I will raise it.*

3. This notion makes the Raiser, and the raised, to be the same: which is as incongruous as to speak the Maker, and the thing made to be the same. Therefore when he saith, *I will raise it up*, he speaks not as Man, for as such he was to be raised: but as God, who alone is the raiser of the dead. And, 4. The

4. The aſcription of it to the Father doth not deny the co-operation of the Son: as the aſcription of it to the Son doth not deny the co-operation of the Father; for then thoſe Texts, of which ſome aſcribe it to the Father, others to the Son, muſt be contradictory. But the aſcription of it to both doth declare the Divinity of both, becauſe now both muſt be God, or elſe they could not raiſe the dead.

His next Scripture, which is *Mat.* 28. 18. *All Power is given me*; is already anſwered in *Arg.* 2. For this Power here given him reſpects only the Government of the Church, to which he was now exalted; which the Pſalmiſt expreſſes by ſeting him a King on the Holy Hill of *Sion*: but this doth not prove that he had not, antecedent to this, a Power with the Father in the Government of the World. This proves he had now a new Government, but doth not prove that therefore he was not God: becauſe the Father had a new Government upon the Creation of the World, but yet was God. Such additionals prove an alteration in the things added, but not in thoſe Divine Perſons, to whom they are added. All the difference is, this Power was given the Son. True, but this (as be-

fore) ſpeaks the Son ſubordinate to the Father, but doth not deſtroy his Nature, by which he is God.

Argum. 7. p. 11. *Chriſt in the Scriptures is always ſpoken of as a diſtinct and different Perſon from God: and is deſcribed to be the Son of God, and the Image of God.*

Anſw. He is perſonally diſtinct, and therefore is not God the Father: but he is not eſſentially diſtinct, and therefore muſt be God the Son. If the *Socinian* then would gain his point, he muſt prove not only [a] diſtinction, which we grant; but [ſuch] a diſtinction, which we deny.

But he hath ſaid that Chriſt is the *Son of God*, and *the Image of God*; whence he concludes, *p.* 12. thus, *it is as impoſſible that the Son, or Image of the one true God, ſhould himſelf be that One true God; as that the Son ſhould be the Father, and the Image be the very thing, whoſe Image it is.*

Anſw. Profoundly argued, and like a a *Socinian!* For he falſly ſuppoſes that the Father only is the One true God: when Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are together the one true God. Therefore take the *One true God*, and the inviſible God, perſonally for the Father only; and we grant that the Son of that One true God cannot be that

that One true God, becauſe the Son cannot be the Father: and that the Image of the inviſible God cannot be the inviſible God, becauſe (as he ſaith) the Image cannot be that very thing, whoſe Image it is.

But take the *One true God*, and the *inviſible God*, eſſentially for Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, and then the Son with the Father, and Holy Spirit, is that One true God: and the Image of the inviſible God, with the Father and Holy Ghoſt, is that inviſible God; becauſe all three Perſons together are the one true and inviſible God.

Now the Son is called the *Image of the inviſible God*, becauſe as an Image repreſents that very thing, whoſe Image it is, ſo the Son repreſents the Father, as having in himſelf all the perfections of the Father flowing from the ſame Eſſence common to both. Whence he ſaith, *John* 14. 8. *He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father*; becauſe as *Hilar. Pict. Epiſt. de Trin. l.* 9. gloſſes, the Father is ſeen in the Perfections of the Son; and conſequently the Son muſt be of the ſame Nature with the Father.

Our Doctrine then is not *ſimply impoſſible*, and *contradictory to common ſenſe*, as the Letter pretends: but theirs is palpably

falſe and abſurd; for all theſe Arguments (as he calls them) run upon theſe two falſe ſuppoſitions; *viz.*

1. That there is but one Nature in Chriſt: for he proves that Chriſt is Man, and thence concludes he cannot be God; when the Scriptures abundantly declare that he is both.

2. That there is but one Perſon in the God-head: for he often proves that Chriſt is not God, *viz.* the Father, as many of his quotations muſt be underſtood; and thence concludes he is not God; though the Scriptures prove that Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt are God.

Thus he ſuppoſes what we deny, that there is but one Nature in Chriſt, and but one Perſon in the God-head; but proves only what we grant, *viz.* that Chriſt is Man, and that the Son is not the Father.

But let him prove firſt that there is but one Nature in Chriſt, and then that Chriſt is Man: and again, firſt that there is but one Perſon, *viz.* the Father in the God-head; and then that the Son is not the Father; from each of which it will follow that the Son cannot be God; nothing leſs can conclude his point: but this method of his proves nothing againſt us, but only be-

betrays the *Socinians* want either of Honesty or Judgment.

However, he concludes his Arguments (as he calls them) with a *Socinian* Confidence; asserting, *p.* 13. that there is in Scripture no real foundation for the Divinity of the Son. For proof of which he now flyes above common Argument, and can stoop to nothing below Demonstration.

§. Demonst. 1. par. 8. p. 13.— *So many Scriptures expresly declare, that only the Father is God.* For proof of this he quotes, John 17. 1, 3. *Father — this is Eternal Life, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.*

Answ. The Letter saith, that *Only the Father is God*, which denyes the Son, and Holy Ghost is God: but this Text saith, the *Father is the only true God*: this excludes the Gentile Gods, but not the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who with the Father are the only true God. He here removes the exclusive particle [only] from the prædiciate, the [*true God*] to the subject [thee] for (pardon the repetition) the Apostle saith— *thee the only true God*; but the *Socinian* saith, *only thee the true God*; which is such a corruption of the Text contraty to all antient

and

and authentick reading, that utterly perverts the very ſenſe and deſign of it.

You have then a Demonſtration indeed, not that *only the Father is God*, but that the Scriptures and *Socinianiſm* are at odds; and that the one or the other muſt be Reformed.

The next words [and Jeſus Chriſt, whom thou haſt ſent] do Diſtinguiſh the Son from the Father as to Office, ſo doth 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. there is *but one God* —— and *One Lord*; but they do not Diſtinguiſh him as to Nature. The ſame is true of other Quotations under this Head; and conſequently none of 'em prove what he undertakes, *viz.* that only the Father is God.

Demonſt. 2. parag. 9. p. 14. *If Chriſt were God as well as Man, it had been altogether Superfluous to give the Holy Ghoſt to his ſaid Human Nature as a Director, and a Guide: For what other help could that Nature need, which was one Perſon with (as they ſpeak) God the Son, and in which God the Son did perſonally dwell?*

His Quotations are *Luke* 4. 1. *Act.* 1. 2 and *Ch.* 10. 38. Which prove only this; that the Holy Ghoſt was given to the Human Nature of Chriſt: Which the poor Man thinks a Demonſtrative proof, that Chriſt

Christ was not United to the Eternal Word, or Son of God; and Consequently was not God.

1. This Demonstration (as he calls it) is founded not upon Scripture, but upon a *Socinian* Presumption. For no Scripture saith, that if the Son was God, he should not have had the Presence and Conduct of the Spirit of God. And certainly it is a Monstrous way of Arguing, that this or that is necessary for God to have done, or not to have done, and then to conclude, he hath, or hath not done it: For this is no better, than to limit the Almighty, to give Rules to Infinite Wisdom, and to make not the Scripture, but our own blind Conceits, the Rule of our Faith. In this way the *Romanists* Demonstrate an Universal Head of the Church: Some the Divine Right of this, or that Form of Church-Government; and after the same Methods, others may as well Demonstrate away all Religion, and introduce what they please of their own.

2. His Foundation is utterly false. For the Church is the Body of Christ, which *Ephes.* 4. 15, 16. is said to be *fitly joyned to him* our Head, to intimate that he doth actuate, and guide it; and yet notwithstanding

ſtanding this, the *Spirit* is ſent to lead her into all Truth. Where let the *Socinian* tell me, why both the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit, may not guide the Humane Nature, as well as the Myſtical Body of Chriſt.

3. It follows, that the ſame works of God are aſcribed now to one Perſon, then to another: Thus we find it in this of Conduct, in that of Creation, &c. but this doth not deſtroy, but rather declare and confirm the Doctrine of a Trinity: Becauſe it proclaims thoſe Powers and Operations, which the *Socinian* would Limit to one Perſon, to be common to all three; whence it follows, that all three muſt be God.

Demonſt. 3. *parag.* 10. *p.* 15. We have an Inſtance of this in the Demonſtration now before us. For he would not have the Son to be God, becauſe he Aſcribes his Miracles to the Holy Spirit, Mat. 12. 28. *I caſt out Devils by the Spirit of God.* Now this doth not prove the Son is not God, any more than the Aſcribing Creation to the Son, doth prove that the Father did not Create. But it is a good ſtep toward the proving that the Holy Ghoſt is God; For Miracles cannot be wrought but by a Divine Power, there-

therefore if the Holy Ghost hath such a Power of Miracles, that they are wrought by him, if he be a Person which we shall easily prove, he must be a Divine Person, and that is God.

Demonst. 4. parag. 11. p. 15. *Had our Lord been more than a Man, the Prophecies of the Old Testament —— would not Describe him barely as the Seed of the Woman.* ——

Answ. They Describe him as such, but not barely as such; for they Describe him also as God. Thus Isa. 40. 3. *Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make strait in the Desert an High way for our God.* This is evidently spoke of the *Messias*, and the *Evangelists* with one consent, apply it to Christ, *Mat.* 3. 3. *Mark* 1, 2, 3. *Luk.* 3, 4. and *Joh.* 1. 23. Where they all agree, that the Voice in the Wilderness, was the *Baptist*; and that the way he was to prepare, was the way of the *Messias*; therefore according to their Application of Scripture, the Prophet doth Stile the Son, the Lord our God.

Observe farther, that this Text calls the *Messias Lord*, in the *Hebrew*, it is *Jehovah*, which (we shall prove) is an Incommunicable Name of God, which therefore Asserts the Divinity of him, to whom it is applyed: And consequently the Prophet in

this

this place declares him to be God in a proper Sense.

Compare *Pſal.*46.6,7. with *Heb.*1.8. and *Pſal.* 102. 25. with *Heb.* 1.10. and you will find, that according to the Apoſtle's Application of thoſe Texts, the *Pſalmiſt* Aſcribes to the Son, an Everlaſting Throne, and the Creation of the World; and certainly this Deſcribes him not as the Seed of the Woman, but as God.

§. 4. This Pen having thus attack'd the Divinity of the Son, now turns it ſelf againſt that of the Holy Ghoſt; affirming *p.* 16. that *the Holy Ghoſt —— is only the Power and Inſpiration of God, at leaſt is not himſelf God, which they hold is aſcertain'd by theſe Conſiderations.*

Conſid. 1. *The Holy Ghoſt or Spirit, and the Power of God, are ſpoken of as one and the ſame thing,* 1 *Cor.*2.4,5. *Luke* 1.35. Ch.11. 20. Mar. 12.28. Luk.24. 49. *Compared with* Act.1.4,5.

Anſw. He is here to prove, that the Holy Ghoſt is only the Power and Inſpiration of God, but is not himſelf God, but theſe Texts ſay no ſuch thing, and conſequently do not aſcertain this Poſition.

2. The Bleſſed Spirit is not properly the Inſpiration of God, but ſomething diſtinct from

from it. For 1 *Cor.* 12. 8, 9, 10. *Wisdom*, *Faith*, *&c.* are given by the Spirit: Whence *Heb.* 2. 4. they are called the *Gifts of the Holy Ghost*. Hence each Text Distinguishes between the Spirit, and these Gifts: But neither of them are the Inspiration of God. For Inspiration is the Act, whereby the Holy Ghost Conveighs these Gifts to Men, which *v.* 11. is called *a dividing* them.

This is clear from 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. all Scripture is Θεόπνευστος inspired, or *given by the Inspiration of God*. Here Scripture is the gift or thing inspired, God is the giver or inspirer; therefore Inspiration can be but the Act, whereby it is given or Inspired. Therefore as the Graces before mentioned, viz. *Wisdom*, *Faith*, *&c.* are the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, so the Holy Ghost, must give them by way of Inspiration. The *Socinian* then doth here confound the Agent and the Act, making the Giver and the Giving, the same thing; which is as false and absurd, as to say my Act of Donation is my Person.

3. He Asserts, that the Holy Ghost is only the *Power of God*, that is, as he often explains himself, is neither God, nor a Person. But this is neither proved, nor ever can be; because such Power can know no more of God, than a Grace or Vertue can do,

do, which are qualities, not persons: But 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. The *Spirit searches all things, even the deep things of God*: Whence the Spirit must be not a simple Power, but a Person endowed with an Infinite knowledge, and that can be no other than God.

What the Letter opposes, the Scriptures are clear in; for *Act.* 5. Ananias *did lye to the Holy Ghost*, whence *v.* 4. saith, he *lyed not to Man, but to God*. Therefore the Holy Ghost must be God.

Eniedimus, who is much more Manly in his performances, than this *Epistler* Parallels this of *Ananias*, lying to the Holy Ghost, and to God, with the *Jews* Rejecting *Samuel* and God: Thus, the *Jews* Rejected *Samuel* immediately, who was set over them; but they Rejected God mediately, who did set *Samuel* over them: So *Ananias* lyed to the Holy Ghost immediately, who was given to the Apostles: But he lyed to God mediately, who gave the Holy Ghost to the Apostles; whence as the *Jews* did Sin differently against *Samuel* and God, *viz.* immediately, and mediately, so did *Ananias* against the Holy Ghost and God, whence he would have the Holy Ghost and God, as much distinct, as *Samuel* and God; and that is essentially.

Answ.

Answ. That place as put by the Objector, is not parallel with this: For that saith, they Rejected not *Samuel*, but God; but this doth not say, that *Ananias* lyed not to the Holy Ghost, but to God. Therefore this Text doth not distinguish between the Holy Ghost, and God, as that doth between *Samuel* and God: And consequently the Holy Ghost and God, are not here made so distinct, as *Samuel* and God.

But take these Texts right, and we may allow a Parallel. But then it must lye between *Samuel* and *Peter*; and again between God and the Holy Ghost; thus the *Jews* thought they Rejected *Samuel* only, as *Ananias* thought he lyed to *Peter* only; but saith God to *Samuel*, they Reject *not thee, but me*: And saith *Peter* to *Ananias*, thou *hast lyed to the Holy Ghost*; that is, *not to Men, but to God.* Therefore while that Text distinguishes between *Samuel* and God, as different, this Unites the Holy Ghost, and God as the same.

Consid. 2. p. 17. *A Manifest Distinction is made, as between God and Christ, so also between God and the Holy Ghost: So that 'tis impossible the Spirit should be God himself.* His Quotations are, Rom. 5. 5. — *the Love*

of God is shed abroad in our Hearts, by the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. 3. 16. ——*ye are the Temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you*, and Rom. 8. 27. *he (the Spirit)* v. 26. *makes Intercession for the Saints, according to the Will of God.*

Answ. He knows we grant there is a personal Distinction, that as the Son, so the Holy Ghost is not God the Father. This is all these Texts do prove, without which there could not be a Trinity. But none of 'em prove that the Son and Holy Ghost are not God, which is the design of this Consideration.

But because Rom. 8. 27. here quoted, Ascribes Personal Acts to the Holy Ghost—*he makes Intercession*: Therefore, that he may at once destroy his Divinity, and Personality both, he pleads, that *the Holy Ghost is spoke of as a Person by the same Figure, that Charity is described as a Person*, 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5. The Argument lyes thus, Personal Acts cannot prove the Holy Ghost to be a Person, because they cannot prove that Charity is a Person.

Answ. This doth as effectually destroy the Personality of the Father and the Son, as of the Holy Ghost: For (according to this

this Argument) Personal Acts do not prove the Father or the Son to be Persons; because they do not prove, that Charity is a Person; but that Argument which proves too much, proves nothing at all.

2. The Scriptures do Ascribe to the Holy Ghost, not only those Personal Acts which they do not to Charity, or to any thing else, which is not a Person: But a Subsistence to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, together in the same Text 1 *John* 5. 7. there *are* three —— *the Father*, *the Word*, and *the Holy Ghost*, implying, that the Subsistence of the Holy Ghost is as Real and Personal, as that of the Father, and the Son. They Ascribe to him also Life, Understanding, Will and Power; For 1 *Cor.* 12. 11. he divides the Manifold Gifts of God, to every one as himself *Will*: Whence these two Cases are so unlike, that even *Biddle* the *Socinian*, was ashamed of it. For (notwithstanding this of Charity) he Asserts the Personality of the Holy Ghost, even while he denies his Divinity.

3. Scripture must not be taken figuratively, without a necessity, else you may turn the whole into an Allegory, and loose at once both the Letter and Design in a

Cabaliſtical Senſe. Now this neceſſity doth lye in the Caſe of Charity, as much as in that of the *Anthropomorphites* mentioned, *Let.* 4 *p.* 159. For all Men do as well know, that Charity can be no Perſon, as that God can have no Human Parts, as Eyes, Ears, Hands, *&c.* but this is ſo far from lying in the Caſe of the Holy Ghoſt, that *Let.* 3. *p.* 99. doth confeſs, *that all the* Arrians, *and many* Socinians *do acknowledge, that the Holy Ghoſt is a Perſon.* Whence this is a conceit ſo weak, as well as Novel, that even the *Unitarians* themſelves (as he idlely calls them) are divided upon it. It is plain then, that in the Judgment of their own Party, as well as of the Church in all Ages, here is no neceſſity of a Figurative Interpretation; and conſequently no ſuch ought to be admitted. The *Socinian* Arguments (we ſee) are like Ghoſts, that appear only to whom they pleaſe, ſince none but a few of their own Party have yet diſcerned 'em.

Conſid. 3. p. 18. *The Spirit is obtained for us of God by our Prayers,* Act. 15. 8. Luk. 11. 13. Whence he thinks the Spirit is not God, becauſe he is given by another.

Anſw.

Answ. By the Spirit he here understands the Gifts of the Spirit; as himself explains it: whence he proceeds thus: *but they, viz.* the *Socinians*, say also, *That if the Holy Spirit were at all a Person, much more God, his Gifts——would be bestowed by himself.* which,

1. Convinces him of contradiction: for he saith, they are the gifts of the Spirit, yet denyes that they are given by the Spirit: which is as much as to say, they are given by the Spirit, and yet are not given by the Spirit, which is a contradiction in terms. And,

2. This utterly destroys his Argument, which is this, that the Spirit doth not bestow his own gifts, therefore the Spirit is not God, but the Spirit must bestow his own gifts, else they could not be his own gifts, but must be the gifts of him that bestows 'em; therefore the antecedent being false, the consequent must be false too.

Now that the Spirit doth bestow these things, which he acknowledges to be the gifts and graces of the Spirit, is expressly asserted by St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 8, 9, 10, 11. where he saith of these very gifts and graces of the Spirit, that the Spirit *divides*

them to every one as he will; and if he devides 'em to Men, he muſt give 'em to Men; becauſe theſe are Synonymous Terms, which are both expreſſive of the ſame thing.

The Texts he quotes, do prove theſe things are given by the Father, we grant it: but this, and other Texts do prove they are given alſo by the Spirit; but thoſe Texts can no more exclude the Spirit, than theſe can exclude the Father. Therefore they muſt be given by both, as indeed they are by the whole Trinity; for which reaſon they are aſcribed now to one Perſon, then to another; as *Faith, Repentance*, &c. which are the gifts of the Spirit, are attributed not to the Spirit only, but ſometimes to the Father, as himſelf proves, and ſometimes to the Son, as the Apoſtle declares, *Act.* 5. 31. *him, viz.* the Son *hath God exalted — to be a Prince, and a Saviour, to give Repentance* (which implyes Faith) *to Iſrael*; and *Act.* 2. ſpeaking of the gift of Tongues, ſaith, *v.* 32, 33. that Jeſus, who was raiſed from the dead, *being by the right hand of God exalted*, [he] *viz.* the ſame Jeſus *hath ſhed forth this*, which *ye do ſee and hear*. The reſult is,

1. That

1. That the *Socinian* is partial and unjust, in quoting one Text of Scripture in opposition to another; And,

2. He hath not only lost his own Argument, but hath also furnished us with one against himself; for he argues thus, the Spirit doth not give these gifts to men; therefore the Spirit is not God; which implyes that if the Spirit doth give these gifts, then the Spirit is God; but (we see) he doth give these gifts, and therefore must be God. And indeed he can be no other than God, who divides these manifold gifts of God according to his own Will.

He proceeds, *there is no Precept, nor Example in all Holy Scripture of Prayer made to the Spirit on this, or any other occasion; which (on the* Trinitarian *supposition) that the Holy Spirit is a Person, and God; no less than the Father, is very surprizing, nay utterly unaccountable.*

Answ. We deny it, for 2 *Cor.* 13. 16. we read thus; *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all*; which Text we shall first explain, and then apply it to the present Argument.

That word [God] *the love of God*, muſt not be taken eſſentially for God, as if the Son, and Holy Ghoſt were not God: but perſonally for God the Father, and therefore can diſtinguiſh them only from the Father. My reaſons are theſe,

1. Other Scriptures (as we have ſaid) do not only ſtile the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt God, but do alſo aſcribe to them infinite Perfections, which are not competible to any Creature; and likewiſe attribute to them the Name *Jehovah*, which is proper to God, as we ſhall prove anon. Therefore if you make that word [God] in this Text to ſignifie God eſſentially, and conſequently to exclude the Son, and Holy Ghoſt from the Deity; then this Text muſt contradict all them: but that cannot be the true ſenſe of one Text, which contradicts another. And,

2. St. *Paul* himſelf doth thus explain it, *Epheſ.* 6. 23. ——*Faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*: where he diſtinguiſhes the Son not ſimply from God, but from God the Father; this denyes that the Son is the Father, but ſtill implyes that the Son is God. Now this Text being the more full and perfect, explains that in the *Co-*

rin-

rinthians, by teaching us to ſupply theſe words [the Father] *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the love of God*, viz. *the Father, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt*—Now this Text thus ſupplyed and perfected by that, doth make a diſtinction of Perſons, but not of Eſſences, that is, it teaches that the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, are not the Father, but yet one God. This ſenſe St. *Paul* expreſſed to the *Epheſians*, and therefore muſt intend it to theſe *Corinthians*.

Now the Text, thus explained, is not only a benediction to this Church, but alſo a Prayer to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt, that this Grace may deſcend upon it.

We never pray to God, but we pray to Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, which was the judgment of Antiquity: For *Juſtin Martyr*, who floriſhed in the middle of the Age next after the Apoſtles, ſaith in his Apologie, we Chriſtians worſhip Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and yet againſt gentile Polytheiſm in the ſame Apology declares, that they worſhiped *God only*; therefore they muſt neceſſarily underſtand it, that all three Perſons together are that one God, whom they worſhiped, and to whom

whom they prayed, which is one part of Worſhip.

But you will ſay, what is the reaſon then, we are not commanded to pray expreſly and particularly to the Holy Ghoſt, as we are to God?

Anſw. 1. In divers Scriptures [God] is put eſſentially for Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; therefore in thoſe Scriptures all Commands, and Examples of praying to God, are to be underſtood incluſively of all three Perſons, who are eſſentially one, and the ſame God.

2. The Father is the firſt Perſon in the Trinity, of and from whom the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are; therefore as for this reaſon the Son refers things principally to the Father, but not excluſive of himſelf; ſo for the ſame reaſons Prayers are directed principally to the Father, but yet are to be underſtood incluſive of the Son, and Holy Ghoſt, but not excluſive of them.

3. The Father is principal Agent in the Government of the World; and the firſt mover in all Divine Operations, ſaying to the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, *let us make Man*: whence the Son ſaith, John 5. 17. *my Father works hitherto, and I work*; by

which

which he ſpeaks the Father principle Operator, but himſelf a Co-operator with him.

Again, the Son from the Father hath the Government of the Church, whence it is called the Kingdom of Chriſt, to which the Father Exalted him, and from the Father and the Son, the Holy Ghoſt is in the Miniſtration of it. Upon which Accounts, Prayers are directed primarily, and expreſly to the Father, but yet are intended as extenſive to the Son and Holy Ghoſt. They are directed moſt particularly to him from his Priority of Order and Operation; but yet they belong to all three in regard of the ſameneſs of their Nature.

Theſe things are ſuited to the Rules and Methods of the Divine Oeconomy, and may ſeem difficulties; but had our Conſideren conſidered well, he had never made them ſupports of an Hereſie.

Conſid. 4. p. 19. *If the Holy Spirit, and our Lord Chriſt are —— God, no leſs than the Father, then God is a Trinity of Perſons, or three Perſons; but this is contrary to the whole Scripture, which ſpeaks of God as but one Perſon; and ſpeaks of him, and to him by ſingular Pronouns, ſuch as I, Thou, me, Him, &c.*

Anſw.

Anſw. We deny that any one Text of Scripture, doth prove that God is but One Perſon. He quotes, Job. 13. 7, 8. *Will ye ſpeak wickedly for God? —— Will ye accept his Perſon?* —— Whence he thinks, there can be but one Perſon, *viz.* the Father in the God-head. To which we Anſwer thus.

1. The letter of theſe Texts doth not ſay, that God is but One Perſon: Or that there is but one Perſon in the Godhead, which is the thing to be proved.

2. The Reaſon and Deſign of 'em, cannot poſſibly import any ſuch thing. For theſe expreſſions are uſed to ſignifie only the doing unjuſtly for God, as Men do for others, when ſaid to accept their Perſons. For *Job* hereby accuſes his Friends of Injuſtice and Partiality, in that they juſtified God's Viſitations upon, by Condemning him of Hypocriſie. Therefore theſe Texts are not ſuited to the Nature of God, nor deſigned to Determine, whether there be only one, or more Perſons in the God-head, but to ſignifie unjuſt Cenſures; and therefore muſt import not a Singularity or Plurality of Perſons, but only Partiality in their Judgment, between God and himſelf.

Will

Will ye ſpeak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for him? Will ye accept his Perſon?

3. Phraſes that are taken from the common uſuages of Men, or as common forms of Speech, are not to be uſed in an Argument, in which the Holy Pen-man did not intend them to the Contradiction of thoſe Texts, which profeſſedly ſpeak of that point, this all Men of Reaſon and Judgment, muſt grant me; becauſe in expounding Scripture, we are to conſider not only Words, but Phraſes, together with the Scope and deſign of the place, and if ſo, it muſt be granted in this Caſe before us, that theſe Texts in *Jobe*, which concern not the Nature of God, ought not to be brought to prove, there is but one perſon in the God-head, when ſo many Texts on ſet purpoſe, declare the Divine Nature of three.

He quotes alſo, *Heb.* 1.1.2,3. *God — hath ſpoken to us by his Son, who being —— the expreſs Image of his Perſon.*

Anſw. 1. God here muſt ſignifie the Father, becauſe he ſpeaks to us by his Son, whence the Son is the Image of his Father's Perſon. But however this doth not reach

teach his Caſe; for it proves indeed, that God the Father is but one Perſon, which we all grant: But it doth not prove there is no other Perſon in the God-head, which is the thing in controverſie. Nay,

2. This Text is not only, not for, but is really againſt, him. For if the Son be the expreſs Image of his Father, he muſt duly Repreſent the Father, as Images duly Repreſent thoſe things, whoſe Images they are: And if he, the Living Image of his Father, duly Repreſents the Father, he muſt have in himſelf all the Perfections of his Father, and conſequently muſt be infinite himſelf, elſe he could not in his own Perſon or Nature, Repreſent infinite Perfections; and that he doth ſo, is evident, not only from his being Termed the Image of his Father, but alſo from thoſe words of his once quoted already, *Joh.* 14. 8. he *that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father.* So far is this Text from proving, but one Perſon in the God-head, that it conſequentially introduces a ſecond.

He cites, Deut. 6. 4, 5. —— *the Lord our God is One*: the word is *Jehovah*, whence the Letter ſaith, *Jehovah is one*, and *that the* Jews *Morning and Evening Repeated*

this

this Verſe, to keep it in perpetual Memory, that Jehovah *or God, is one only, not two or three.*

Anſw. The meaning is, there is but One God, which is ſpoke in oppoſition to Gentile Gods, which the *Jews* were ſo much inclined to, not that there is but One Perſon in the God-head, which was never diſputed among them. We ſay then, that *Jehovah* or God, is but One, *viz.* Nature or Subſtance, that is, there is but one God, which is all this Text can pretend to, and all that our *Socinian* can prove: But we ſay likewiſe, that *Jehovah* or God, is three Perſons, *viz.* Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt. That the Father is *Jehovah* or God, the *Socinian* grants us, and that the Son and Holy Ghoſt are *Jehovah*, or God, we will prove.

1. That the Son is *Jehovah*, or God will appear from hence. In *Exod.* 33. 1, 2, 3. the *Lord*, the word is *Jehovah*, ſaid, *I will ſend my Angel, but I will not go up into the midſt of thee.* Now as the Letter ſuppoſes, that *Jehovah* is God, ſo in this very place, it can ſignifie no other than God properly. Becauſe,

1. *Jehovah* is here Diſtinguiſhed from an Angel, as ſuch, and therefore from every Angel, *I will ſend my Angel, but I will not go.* —— and

2. He

2. He declares his propriety in this Angel, for it is [my] Angel: An Angel that is *mine*, that is, my Creature, and my Servant: Which gloſs I found upon this bottom, that we never find in all the Scripture, that one Angel ſpeaks thus of another; for though there be different orders of Angels, yet they are all Servants of God, not the Servants one of another. Therefore this muſt ſpeak this *Jehovah* to have that Right to Propriety in, and that Power over this Angel, which God has to, in, and over his Creatures.

Then *Gen.* 18. 1. *The Lord* i. e. Jehovah, *appeared to* Abraham, *v.* 2. expreſſes it by *three Men*; but *v.* 3. calls only one of theſe three *Jehovah*, or Lord, the ſame is ſo called again, *v.* 13. 20. and *v.* 22. doth again expreſſly call theſe two [Men] but this [*Jehovah*] This only was Dignified with theſe Titles, to this only did *Abraham* bow himſelf, and direct his Diſcourſe. Now ſince this *Jehovah* is ſo induſtriouſly diſtinguiſhed from theſe Men, as he was before from that Angel; and *v.* 25. is called *the Judge of the World*; which neither is true, nor was ever affirmed,

of

of any created Spirit, it muſt needs be that this Jehovah is God. But now this Jehovah cannot be the Father, becauſe

1. This Jehovah appeared in humane ſhape, as, to *Joſhua*, to *Moſes*, ſo to *Abraham*, whence himſelf, and the two with him, are called Men, *v.* 2: but the Father never appeared in humane ſhape; and the Teaching that he did was antiently, as well as juſtly, condemned as part of the Patropaſſion Hereſie: and

2. Theſe three are called Angels *Heb.* 13. 2, becauſe they were ſent, as the Word imports; but the Father being the firſt Perſon in the Trinity, cannot be ſent from any.

The Reſult then is, here is Jehovah *i. e.* God appearing in the likeneſs of Men, but the Father never did appear in this likeneſs, therefore this could not be Jehovah, or God the Father; but muſt be Jehovah, or God the Son, whom the Father ſent in humane ſhape as an intimation of his future Incarnation. This is evident from *Joſhua*; for *c.* 5. *v.* 13. he ſees a Man with a drawn Sword, and asks, Who he was for? The Man anſwered,

v. 14. *As Captain of the Host of the Lord am I come.* Here this Man is Captain of the Host of *Jehovah* the Lord; and yet *c.* 6. *v.* 2. this Man, this Captain, is himself Jehovah the Lord; for after he had answered *Joshua*, and commanded him to put off his shooe, because the Place was holy *c.* 5. *v.* 15, then *c.* 6. *v.* 2. Jehovah *the Lord*, *i. e.* this Man, this Captain, said to *Joshua* —— Therefore the former Jehovah, or Lord, is the Father, whose Host this was; and the latter Jehovah, or Lord, is the Son, who was sent from the Father as Captain of it.

This was the Sense of all Antiquity; for so *Justin Martyr Dial.* so *Irenæus* l. 4. c. 15. and 23. and so *Tertul. de Incar.* c. 6. and *adv. Marc.* l. 3. c. 9. who were followed by *Cyprian*, *Origen*, and the rest.

Again *Gen.* 19. 24. the Lord [Jehovah] rained down Fire from the Lord [Jehovah] in Heaven. The Series of this History shews that the former Jehovah is the very same with Jehovah *ch.* 18; whence, the latter must be the Father, who was in Heaven: This was the Judgment not only of the fore-cited Fathers, but also of the

the first Council of *Sirmium*. And indeed as this Appearance in humane shape was a Signification of his future Incarnation; so his raining down Fire from Heaven was a Type of the last Conflagration, when this Jehovah the Son shall come from Jehovah the Father to judge the Quick and the Dead: for which reason *Abraham* calls him the *Judge of the World*, Gen. 18. 25.

We shall confirm and conclude our Point in our Answer to *Crellius*, who, *de Nomine Jehovah*, objects several things against us with a design to perswade that [Jehovah] is not a Name proper to God, but is sometimes given to Angels properly taken; and consequently, that this Jehovah was not the Son, but only an Angel of God.

Object. 1. These three in *Genesis* 18. are called Angels *Heb.* 13. 2.

Ans. They are likewise called Men *Gen.* 18. 2. Whence let the *Socinian* tell me

1. Why one of these Angels may not be the Son of God, as well as these three Men be Angels? And then,

2. Why the other two should be called only Men and Angels, but this be stiled

Jehovah, whom the Scriptures distinguish from Men and Angels, unless to denote the distinction of his Nature from all created Beings: and why he should then be joined with the Father under the same Name Jehovah *Gen.* 19. unless to declare the sameness of his Nature with the Creator, God blessed for ever?

Object. 2. *He who is called Lord* [*Jehovah*] *in Exod.* 3. 7. *is expresly said to be an Angel of the Lord*, v. 2. Whence he thinks that Jehovah is a Name not proper to God, but common to Created Spirits.

Ans. Angel doth note his Office, as being sent from the Father; and Jehovah notes his Nature, as being of the same Substance with the Father: for *v.* 6. this Jehovah saith, *I am the God of Abraham*; and *v.* 14. he stiles himself ὁ ὤν, *I am*; this implies a perpetual Existence from everlasting to everlasting, which is not competible to any Creature. Hence our Saviour saith *Matt.* 22. 31, 32. *Have ye not read*, not what God spake to you by his Angel, but *that which is spoke to you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham* — Where our Saviour himself, who is the best

beſt Interpreter of Scripture, teaches that this Jehovah was not a created Spirit, but even God himſelf. Upon which *Juſtin Martyr Apol.* ſaith, this is ἀμήτορος γεννᾶς, our Chriſt. And *Tertul. adv. Prax.* c. 14. *Deum* i. e. *Filium Dei Viſum—Moyſi—God*, that is, the Son of God was ſeen by *Moſes*: the ſame you have again c. 16. See *Cypr. adv. Jud.* l. 2. &c.

Object. 3. Jehovah is indeed a Name proper to God, but yet is ſometimes given to Angels, as they perſonate God, *i. e.* bear his Name and Authority.

Anſ. Here was not only the Name and Authority of God, but alſo that Honor received which is due to God only; for *Moſes* by ſpecial Command did worſhip him: but you have not one ſuch Inſtance of an Angel that any way appeared to be a created Spirit, that bore the Name and Authority of God, and received the Honor due to God. The Angel to the Bleſſed Virgin ſpoke otherwiſe, and that to S. *John* forbad him to Worſhip him, and that for a reaſon common to all created Angels, *Revel.* 19. 10. *See thou do it not, for I am thy Fellow-Servant.*

As we find no such thing, so neither can any such thing ever be; for God hath said, *My Glory will I not give to another*: but this gives a Creature his Name, his Authority, and his Honor; and these are his Glory. Therefore the matter of this Objection is not only *not* found in the Scripture, but is even contrary to it.

Object. 4. *The Law was given by the disposition of Angels*, Act. 7. 53. *and was spoken by Angels*, Heb. 2. 3. whence he presumes that Jehovah, who gave the Law, was not the Son of God, but a created Angel.

Anſ. This doth not follow: for as it was given by Angels, ſo it was *Gal.* 3. 19. in the *hand of a Mediator*, that is, of Chriſt, as *Theophylact* and others take it. But ſome ſay this Mediator was *Moſes*: be it ſo, it is all one. For if *Moſes* was Mediator, it was only as a Type of Chriſt, and there muſt be an exact Agreement between the Type and the Anti-type; therefore if the Law was given by *Moſes* a typical Mediator, it muſt be given by Chriſt the true and proper Mediator. Whence the Reſult muſt be, that *Moſes* gave it immediately

mediately to the People, but Christ gave it mediately by *Moses*, and by those Angels, which are ministring Spirits. Therefore when S. *John* saith, c. 1. 17. the Law was given *by Moses, but Grace and Truth*, i. e. the Gospel, *came by Jesus Christ*, he respects the immediate Delivery of both; the Law was given immediately by *Moses*, and the Gospel immediately by Christ: which excludes Christ from only an immediate, but not from a mediate Delivery of the Law.

But the Difficulty is from *Heb.* 2. 2, 3. *If the Word spoken by Angels was stedfast, and every Transgression and Disobedience received a just recompence of Reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great Salvation, which at first began to be spoken by the Lord?* Upon which *Crellius* saith, the Gospel, which is the great Salvation, is preferred before the Law, because the Law was given by Angels, but the Gospel by the Lord: and consequently Jehovah, who gave the Law, was not the Lord, but an Angel.

Anſ. This Text, which ſaith the Law was *ſpoken by Angels*, doth no more exclude the Son, than *Joh.* 1. 17. which ſaith the *Law was given by Moſes*, doth exclude thoſe Angels: for indeed it was given by all three. Therefore the Oppoſition lies not between Jehovah and the Son, who are the ſame, and gave both Law and Goſpel too, but

1. Between his different manner of giving each: for (as before) he gave the Law mediately by Angels; but he gave the Goſpel immediately by himſelf, as the Eternal Word now made Fleſh: Upon which account Sin againſt the Goſpel is a greater Affront to his Perſon and Authority, than Sin againſt the Law. And

2. Between the Nature of each conſidered in themſelves: this is a great Salvation in compariſon of that. And becauſe Sin doth always ariſe proportionate to the means it is committed againſt, therefore upon this Account alſo Sin againſt the Goſpel is greater than Sin againſt the Law.

Whence this toping Argument of *Crellius*, which (he ſaith) doth *penitus evertere*

tere totally overthrow us, doth neither exclude Jehovah the Son from giving the Law, nor yet debaſe him to a created Spirit; and conſequently doth not at all affect us.

In fine, we grant that *Jehovah* is ſometimes called an Angel, as he is ſent from the Father; but we deny that an Angel, which is any way declared to be a created Spirit, is ever called *Jehovah*. Let the Socinian prove this, and then we will diſmiſs this Argument: elſe he ſaith nothing to the purpoſe.

2. The Bleſſed Spirit is alſo called *Jehovah*: for *Exod.* 17. 7. they tempted the Lord, the Word is [Jehovah]. This is repeated *Pſal.* 95. whence the Apoſtle *Heb.* 3. 7, 8, 9 thus, the *Holy Ghoſt ſaith*—— *When your Fathers tempted* [*me*]. Therefore (according to the Apoſtles Application of theſe Scriptures) the Holy Ghoſt is this *Jehovah*.

The Reſult is, Jehovah is indeed but one God, but yet is three Perſons; *viz.* Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, who are in the Godhead, and therefore are this one God, which was the thing to be proved.

ved. Whence his next Scripture, which is *Isa.* 45. 5. *I am the Lord*, the Word is [Jehovah] *there is no God before me*, is eafily anſwered. For here Jehovah excludes a Plurality of Gods, but not a Plurality of Perſons in the Godhead.

He adds (in his great Wiſdom and Judgment) *Mat.* 4 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Where becauſe [the Lord thy God] is ſingular, and that Word [only] excludes all others, he thinks he hath found a proof that the Father only is God.

Anſ. This proves indeed that there is but one God, which we all grant; but it doth not prove there is but one Perſon in the Godhead; or that the Son and the Holy Ghoſt are not God; which he undertakes.

But becauſe Suppoſitions grant nothing, we will ſuppoſe that this Text proves that the Father only is God; but then it muſt be granted upon this Suppoſition, that it doth alſo prove, that the Father only is to be worſhipped; for *him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* But the Socinians deny that the Son is God, and yet worſhip him as well

as

as the Father. Whence it evidently follows, that either their Religion muſt be an Hereſie, or themſelves Idolaters; for if the Son be God, they are Hereticks in denying it: if he is not, they are Idolaters in worſhipping him. And certainly theſe Men are put to an hard ſhift for Scripture-Proofs, when all the Texts they cite, do either not affect us, or wound themſelves.

He now proceeds to his ſingular Pronouns, thus; *No Inſtance can be given in any Language of three Perſons; who ever ſpoke of themſelves, or were ſpoken to, by ſingular Pronouns, as I, Thou, &c. Such ſpeaking is contrary to Cuſtom, Grammar, and Senſe.*

Anſ. To this, that of the Learned Dean of St. *Pauls*, Dr. *Sherlock*, is the moſt appoſite, viz. *There is no other Example in Nature of three Perſons, who are eſſentially one.* Whence this is an Impropriety in reference to the Creatures, which is none in reference to God. For he may ſpeak of himſelf, or be ſpoken to, ſingularly, becauſe he is but one God; and plurally, becauſe he is three Perſons, without any ungrammatical Soleciſm. And ſometimes

he doth ſpeak plurally, as *Gen.* 1. 26. *Let us make Man*: whence we conclude a Plurality in the Godhead. But this cannot be a Plurality of Eſſences, or Natures, for then there would be a Plurality of Gods, which is contrary to Scripture, for this declares there is but one; but a Plurality of Subſiſtences, which we call Perſons, united in the ſame Nature. This Plurality other Scriptures, particularly *Pſal.* 33. 6. do determine to three, *viz.* the *Lord*, the *Word*, and the *Spirit*, and 1 *John* 1. 7. the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*: and this we call a Trinity, as the Church ever did from the Apoſtles time.

But to this he ſaith, *God doth here ſpeak of himſelf after the manner of Princes*, p. 21. and therefore is but one Perſon, though he ſaith [Us].

Anſ. 1. He could not ſpeak this after the manner of Princes, for then there was no Prince, nor any Man in the World: nor can he prove any ſuch Cuſtom in the Moſaic Age. Therefore this is an expounding the firſt Writings in the World after the Cuſtom of later Ages, which we cannot allow.

2. In

2. In time Princes ſpoke [of] but not [to] themſelves plurally, which yet God doth do, if this Gloſs be true. Therefore this Expoſition, which he pretends is after the manner of Princes, is indeed without all Example.

3. God himſelf expounds this Text our way, *Pſal.* 33. 6. *By the word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Hoſt of them by the breath of his Mouth*; that is by the *Lord*, *viz.* the Father; by the *Word* or Son, and by the Spirit. Now St *John* c. 1. 1, 3. teaches that by the *Word*, viz. that Word which was *God*, that *Word*, which *v.* 14. *was made Fleſh*, were all things made. Which directs us to underſtand that [Word] in this Pſalm, not of the Command, but of the Eternal, or Subſtantial Word, or Son of God: to whom together with that Spirit, who *Gen.* 1. 1. moved upon the Waters, preparing that indigeſted Matter for its ſeveral forms, the Father ſaid, *Let us make Man.*

This was the Senſe of all Antiquity. *Juſt. Mart. Dial. Iren. l.* 4. *c.* 37. he ſpoke to the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, *per quos*, &

& in quibus omnia —— fecit, by, and in whom, he made all things. *Tertul. de Reſur. carn.* c. 6. and *adv. Prax.* v. 7. *Orig. cont. Celſ.* l. 6. and the *Conſtitutions* l. 5. c. 6. which pretend to give us nothing but what is Apoſtolical.

He proceeds to 2 *Cor.* 10. 2. Some, who think of [us] —— which he ſaith S. *Paul ſpoke of himſelf only.*

Anſ. It is not probable that S. *Paul* ſpoke of himſelf after the manner of Princes, when it is evident he leſſened himſelf in almoſt every thing but Sin and Sufferings.

2. When a Prince ſpeaks plurally, we know he muſt ſpeak of himſelf, becauſe he is but one: but the Apoſtles were many, and under the ſame Cenſures; therefore when S. *Paul* ſpeaks plurally [Us] we have no neceſſity of underſtanding it of himſelf only, but have reaſon to believe he ſpoke of himſelf and them together.

3. Suppoſe that S. *Paul* ſpoke plurally of himſelf, as Princes have done for many Ages, yet what Argument is there in either of theſe to prove that the Father is to be underſtood thus in *Gen.* 1, eſpecially when the Scriptures ſo frequently aſcribe the

the Creation to the Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as well as to the Father? There is therefore nothing manly, or cogent in this Quotation. By this time (I think) his ſingular Pronouns have done him as little ſervice as his Scriptures.

Conſid. 5. and 22. *Had the Son or Holy Ghoſt been God, this would not have been omitted in the Apoſtles Creed, which* (they ſay) p. 23. *was purpoſely drawn up to repreſent all the neceſſary Articles of Religion:* but that the Divinity of each is omitted there he would fain perſwade the World.

This very Argument had almoſt perverted two of my Acquaintance; the one a very ingenious Merchant in this City. I ſhall therefore (according to their deſire) give the fuller Anſwer to it: and ſhall prove

1. That this Creed under the Apoſtles name was never compoſed by the Apoſtles; and

2. Though it doth not expreſly aſſert the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt, yet it ſufficiently teaches both.

1. This Creed was never compoſed by the Apoſtles. Some with more Preſumption than Judgment think *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*

Tertullian againſt us. But if you conſult thoſe famous Places, *Iren. l.* 1. *c.* 2. *&* 19. *Tertul. de Virg. Veland. c.* 1. *de Præſ. Hær. c.* 2. and *adv. Prax. c.* 2. you will find theſe Fathers differ ſo much from one another, and each from himſelf, both as to the Order and Points of Faith they deliver; that they evidently ſeem to intend not any ſetled Form, but the Subſtance of Faith contain'd in the Scriptures, whence themſelves might draw the Articles they deliver.

Irenæus ſaith indeed, that his *Rule of Truth*, i. e. the Articles there writ, came from the Apoſtles; which ſome have thought ſufficient to prove it of Apoſtolical Compoſure. But,

1. Its coming from the Apoſtles is no Argument for them; for that might be from their Writings in the N. Teſt. as well as from this Creed, had they compoſed it.

2. His calling it the *Rule of Truth* is againſt them; for it was not cuſtomary, ſo neither is it ſo proper to call a Creed the *Rule of Faith*, as the Scriptures from whence all Creeds are taken, and by which they muſt be proved. And

3. There

3. There is not so much agreement between the Articles in *Iren.* and this Creed called the Apostles, as between those Articles, and some of those Creeds, which are well known to be the different Creeds of different Churches. Therefore there is nothing in this Father, that can prove the Socinian Assertion; but something, that may incline to the contrary.

As for *Tertullian* the Case is more clear; for he saith *de Præs. Hær. c.* 13. that his *Rule of Faith*, meaning the Articles there mentioned, were taught by Christ: but Christ composed no Symbol: and *adv. Prax. c.* 2. his Rule taught the Mission of the Holy Ghost: but this Creed reaches no such thing. Therefore from both he must intend the Scriptures, not a Creed; or if any, yet however not this.

Arius in Epiphanius adv. Hær. l. 2. *to* 2. *Hær.* 69. would fain have justified his Heresie against the Divinity of the Son from the Creed of *Alexandria*; which differs so much from this under the Apostles name, that none can pretend they are the same. But it must be granted, he would much rather have appealed to this, had it then

been, or believed to be theirs, and also thought not to teach the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, because a Creed composed by the Apostles themselves would have been of much more force and Authority than one composed by any particular Church whatever. Therefore his Appeal to that, but not to this, is to me a Demonstration that this Creed was then not known, or else not believed either to be theirs, or to import any such Doctrine.

It could not come from the Apostles, at least as we now have it, which ought very much to take down Mens Presumptions of its Antiquity, and must totally ruine that of *Heylen*, and *Asmund* in his *Fides Apostolica*, who will have it to be unalterable, and therefore to come from them in all Points as it now is. For,

1. Though ἅδης is brought from the *Psalms* into the *Acts of the Apostles*, and in each place is rendered *Hell*; and tho *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* both speak of Christs going where the Souls of the dead are; yet the strict Phrase [He descended into Hell] is not in any of the antient Creeds

or

or Fathers; nor yet in the Articles mentioned by *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, from whom they pretend to take this Creed itself. The first time we find it is in the *Interpolator* and *Trall*, but this appeared not till the fourth Century; nor could it be wrote till the *Arian* Heresie. For *ad Magnes. Vas. edit. p.* 147. he saith, Christ is the Word of God ὐ ῥητὸς, ἀλλ' ἐνάδιος, not *spoken*, but *substantial*. For though the Notion is agreeable both to Scripture and the most antient Fathers; yet the distinction in these very Words was not known till *Arian* Evasions made it necessary for the securing the sense both of Scripture and Antiquity.

2. The Word [Catholick] which this Creed uses, was not in use among Ecclesiastical Writers in the first Ages. For *Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes.* expresses the thing by a Circumlocution, as the Church κατ' τὰ πέρατα to the ends of the Earth. And *Iren. l.* 1. *c.* 2. the Church καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς all the World over. We find the Word it self first in *Clem. Alex. Strom. l.* 7. but it is not in any of the Eastern Creeds, till that of *Jerusalem*. S. Cy-

prian likewiſe hath the Word; but it is in none of the Latin Creeds, till the fourth Age.

The Epiſtles of *James*, *Peter*, *John* and *Jude*, muſt therefore be intituled *Catholick*, not by the Pen-men, but by ſome later hand. The firſt time I obſerve them cited under this Title, is by *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, who Catech. 6. wrote ſeventy years after *Manes*, who broach'd his Hereſie under *Probus* the Emperor about the year 277.

How then to bring *Heylen* out of the Wood, who places the Apoſtles with every one an Article of this Creed in his mouth as a Frontiſpiece to his Book upon this Subject, aſcribing the Deſcent into Hell to S. *Thomas*, and the [Catholick] Church to S. *James*, I know not. Or whence S. *Auſtin* ſhould have that Story of the Apoſtles bringing every one his Article to the compoſing it, when the four Ages before him knew nothing of the matter: or why any ſhould quote that Tract under his name as his own, which all learned Men (unleſs ſome Romiſh Writers) do now reject as ſpurious, I can as little imagine. To

To conclude this Argument; Had the Apoſtles compoſed this Creed, it would have been found firſt in the Hebrew or Greek Tongues, in which they wrote: it would have been part of the Sacred Scriptures, or at leaſt have been mentioned in the Hiſtory of the Acts, and have been known to all the Churches founded by the Apoſtles, it being pretended to be wrote before their Diſperſion from *Jeruſalem*. But on the contrary we find it not till the fourth Century, and then known only to the Latin Church, which did obtrude it on the World under the Name of the Apoſtles; witneſs *Preuſtius*, *Fevardentius*, *Baronius*, the *Paris* Doctors in their Cenſures of *Eraſmus*, and others, who take up the Cudgels from their old Pope *Leo* in the fifth Age, as he did from *Ruffinus*, and *Ruffinus* from the ſpurious *Clemens* in his Epiſtle to S. *James*; which was ever rejected by all conſidering Men, becauſe it appeared not in the Apoſtolick Ages; and alſo mentions the death of St. *Peter*, who out-lived this *James*, to whom it is directed.

From *Rome* the Reformed Churches received this Doctrine, and that Rubrick of ours which calls it the *Apostles Creed*, is taken out of the Roman Breviary; which our Reformers (not fore-seeing the advantages the Socinians make of it) thought of no such moment as to call for an Alteration. But when our Church composed the Articles of our Religion, she expresses her self thus, Article 8. that *which is commonly called the Apostles Creed*: which doth not only not affirm that it is theirs, but suggests that it is not.

Du Pin, who is more judicious and impartial than his Predecessors, grants that it is the Apostles as to the Doctrine it contains, but denies it to be of their composure; for he saith they *n'avoient point composè de formule de foy, comprise en un certain nombre de mots*, have not composed a *Formula* of Faith comprised in a certain number of Words: he adds, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* did not intend *la formule de foy, mais la foy meme*, a Creed, or form of Faith, but the Faith it self. This is the Judgment of *Vossius*, *Erasmus*, our *Perkins*, and others: however some Men, who make

make a great noise about Antiquity, are pleased to take up an Error from others, instead of understanding the Authors they quote.

Had it not been for these Socinian Impudences discovered in this Letter, and in the fifth to the Publisher, as well as in other of their Writings both at home and abroad; I had rested in that of *Calvin* Instit. l. 2. c. 16. Sect. 18. *Apostolicum nuncupo, de Authore interim minimè solicitus*: I call it the Apostles, but in the mean time trouble not my head about the Author.

But after all this, What ground hath this Letter for his Confidence? It saith, *pag.* 23. this Creed is recited by S. *Cyril*, *S. Cyprian*, and *Socrates* in his Hist. lib. 1. c. 26. Quotations, that are true Socinian; for they are false, but if true, are yet insufficient for their end. For did these Authors recite this Creed, yet how doth this prove the Apostolical Composure of it? But *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* explains a Creed peculiar to that Church, which differs nothing material from that of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, except the Consubstan-

tiality. The English Reader may find it at the end of the Life of this Father written by Dr. *Cave*. S. *Cyprian* hath it not, unless he means a Piece bound up with him in the *Oxford* Edition, which is ascribed by some to S. *Jerom*, by others to *Ruffinus*. Which (if so) must betray either his Ignorance or Sophistry. *Socrates* indeed hath a Creed in the place quoted, but he there tells us, it was composed by *Arius* and *Eusebius*; and begins thus, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα· καὶ εἰς Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων γεγεννημένον Θεὸν λόγον, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. *We believe in one God the Father Almighty, and in the Lord Jesus Christ his Son, who was made of him before all Ages, God the Word, by whom all things were made.*

This, he saith, is the Apostles Creed, which he so earnestly contends for; where observe,

1. What trust we may repose in Socinian Quotations; for if he is so false where he makes a particular Reference, what must the Reader expect where he only names an Author? This Answer will

will prove what I here assert against the whole Party of 'em, That throughout this Letter, there is not one Quotation in seven, but what is either false, or not to his Purpose. If they will have this an Argument of their Learning, they may; but I am sure it is no proof of their Honesty.

2. The Socinian denies that our Saviour did exist before his Incarnation: but this Creed saith, *That he was before all Ages, and made all things.* I demand therefore of our Socinians, that they profess this Faith, or acknowledge themselves the Perverters of Truth, and Debauchers of Antiquity. And indeed (like the *Harpies*) they rarely settle upon any place, but they so pollute it, that it wants a laborious Pen to cleanse, and restore it to it self. He hath then Presumption only, but no colour of Proof, that the Apostles composed this Creed. We therefore proceed to the next part of our Argument.

2. Though this Creed, called the Apostles, doth not expressly assert the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost, yet it sufficiently teaches both. For,

1. It

1. It doth ſtile the Son his [only] Son; which Words indeed in themſelves import only this, That he is a Son in ſuch ſort as none elſe is, which the Socinian would perſwade reſpects not his Divinity, but his being born of a Virgin: but take them together with the Scriptures, whence they are themſelves taken, and by which they muſt be explained, and then it will ſufficiently appear that his only Son is a Son by Nature. Whence *S. Auſtin* in Symb. l. 1. c. 2. *Quando Unicum audis Dei filium, agnoſce Deum*, the only Son of God is God. This ſome other Parts of our Diſpute will evince ſo far as the Letter hath led us to this Argument. But,

2. As to the Holy Ghoſt, he thinks nothing can be here pretended to prove him a Divine Perſon, excepting only the Phraſe of believing with the Prepoſition [in] which is ſet alſo before the Church, and therefore can aſcribe a Divinity to the one no more than to the other.

But his Thoughts are very ſhort, and dull. For though this hath been a common Error, which ſome at this day will hardly be drawn from; yet we declare that

that we neither do, nor need for the eſtabliſhing this Doctrine, hold any ſuch force in this Phraſe. See Dr. *Hammond's Practical Catechiſm*, lib. 5. Dr. *Peirſon*, and *Heylen* upon this Article, who abſolutely deny it; becauſe not this Creed only, but all Antiquity apply it to Men, and ſo do the Sacred Scriptures. They inſtance in *Exod.* 14. 31. *The People believed* [*in*] *the Lord and* [*in*] *Moſes*; and 1 Sam. 27. 20. *Achiſh believed* [*in*] *David.* To which we add that of our Bleſſed Saviour *Joh.* 5. 45. *Moſes εἰς ὃν πεποίθατε, in whom ye believe*, or truſt, as we tranſlate it.

They, with *Muſculus*, and others, impute the Notion to S. *Auſtin* and *Jerom*, whoſe Tranſlation firſt omitted the Prepoſition in theſe Texts of the Old Teſtament, which other Tranſlations follow.

A little before theſe Fathers *Greg. Naz.* acknowledges the Prepoſition in the Tranſlations of his time, but yet ſaith this Phraſe ought to be applied to none but the Lord; for the People did believe in *Moſes* not as *Moſes*, but as a Type of the Lord, and conſequently this did not terminate in *Moſes*, but did refer ultimately to the Lord.

But

But he did not consider that *Achish* believed in *David*, but he could not believe in *David* as a Type of the Lord, when he knew neither the Lord, nor that *David* was any Type at all. Hence *Ashwel* took his Notion of the Peoples believing in *Moses* as *subordinate* to the Lord; but there could be no such subordinate Faith in this Heathen Prince, who yet *believed in David*. This was therefore an Error growing and setling it self in the Church sometime before *Jerom* and *Austin*; but however it was these two that fixed the Point, and by that Omission in that Translation, as well as otherwise occasioned others to ert with them.

But you will say then, where, or how doth this Creed teach the Divinity of the Holy Ghost? I answer that the Son, and the Holy Ghost are put into this Creed as equally Objects of Faith and Worship with the Father; and this is the very thing that declares the Divinity of both. Nor is this from Men, but from God; for it was so done upon the special Precept of our blessed Saviour in the form of Baptism, which is the Original of all Creeds.

I con-

I confeſs the Fathers uſe this Phraſe in their Diſputes for a Trinity. So *Greg. Nyſſ. to. 2. cont. Eunom. l.* 1. if the Holy Ghoſt be not God, Τὸ πρόσωπον εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Why do Men believe the H. Ghoſt? But obſerve, he doth not here Diſpute from the ſole force of that Phraſe of *believing in*, but from our believing in the Holy Ghoſt as well as in the Father, which makes the Bleſſed Spirit equally with the Father a ſharer in our Faith, and Adoration. In this ſenſe is *Hila. Pict. Epiſt. de Trin. l.* 9. who teaches that we cannot believe in the Father without the Son; whence he concludes they muſt be the ſame in Nature: But this Concluſion is drawn not from the Form of the Expreſſion that *we believe in*, but from the Matter expreſſed, that they are both equally the Objects of our Faith.

And indeed there is no ſuch Extravagance in the World as to teach that we believe in God, in a Creature, and a ſimple Power; that he, who will not give his Glory to another, ſhould ſet a meer Creature, and a naked Power, or Inſpiration, which is no Perſon, equal with himſelf in the Faith and Adoration of his People.

So

So falſly doth this Letter pretend from this Creed, that the Apoſtles did believe as the *Socinians* believe; when neither did the Apoſtles compoſe it, nor is it any way ſervicable to the *Socinian* Hypotheſis.

SECT. V.

Now, as if he had proved his Point, when he had proved nothing, but what we may ſafely grant him, he concludes p. 24. parag. 6. *Theirs, viz.* the *Socinians, is an Accountable and a Reaſonable Faith.*

Anſw. A Faith juſt as Reaſonable as this Inference: For as this is drawn from no due Premiſes, ſo that ſtands founded on neither Scripture, nor good Argument. A reaſonable Faith indeed, which makes a Finite God, and an Infinite Creature! Which denies the Son to be God, and yet doth Worſhip him! A reaſonable Faith, which cannot ſupport itſelf without expunging ſome Texts out of the Sacred Canon, without tranſpoſing the parts of others contrary to the Ancient and moſt Authen-

Authentick Reading, and without expounding some contrary to the very Letter, and most evident Design of the place!

Socinus himself was so sensible of the reasonableness of this Faith, that he not only rejects the sense of the Church, but in his Epistle to *Balcerovicius* he allows the offering any force to the Sacred Scriptures, rather than to their own Sentiments; in which our present *Socinians* are his strict Disciples. And *de Jesu Christ. Salvat. parag.* 3. *c.* 6. *to.* 2. he vents himself thus, if I find such things, *non semel, sed sæpè,*—— not once, but often in the Scriptures, *non id circo tamen ita rem prorsus se habere crederem:* I will not for all that belive it. And if this be an accountable and a reasonable Faith, which is founded not on the Scriptures, but on the Wills of Men, then all Heresies must be accountable, and reasonable too. But on the contrary, this must be a most unaccountable, and a most unreasonable, nay a blasphemous, and most dangerous Faith, which makes the Writings of *Socinus*, as *Mahomet* did his Alcoran, the Peoples Bible, and their Rule of Faith!

But that of the *Trinitarians* (he saith) is absurd,

absurd, and *contrary both to Reason, and it self: And therefore is not only false, but impossible.* His Reason is, that we teach there are *Three Almighty, and most Wise Persons, and yet but one God.*

Answ. The Scriptures cannot teach any thing absurd or impossible, but the Scriptures do teach there are three, who are but one God; therefore this Doctrine of ours is not absurd and impossible. Now that there are three, who are but one God, is evident as from other Places, so likewise from 1 *John* 5.7,8. *There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and those three are one. And there be three that bear Witness in Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Bloud; and these three agree in one.* Which Texts I will so clear from all their Cavils, that they shall sufficiently vindicate our Doctrine from being absurd and impossible.

Euiedinus, and the rest, would expunge the last Clause in the 7th Verse, *these three are one.* Because

1. Some Fathers, who wrote professedly on the Trinity, have it not: Whence he makes them to be added by some Enemy of the *Arians.*

Answer.

Anſ. 1. St. *Cyprian* in the middle of the Age before *Arius*, hath this Text intire *de Unit. Eccleſ.* and St. *Jerom* ſoon after *Arius* cenſures the Omiſſion of this Clauſe. Now that of *Eniedinus* is impoſſible, for theſe Words could not be added by ſome Enemy of the *Arians*, in the time of *St. Cyprian*, who flouriſhed almoſt an Age before *Arius* himſelf was. But the careleſs, or deſigned Omiſſion of 'em is neceſſarily true, becauſe the 4th Age wanted them, after St. *Cyprian* in the 3d Age had 'em. Nor do we find many that quarrell'd with St. *Jerome* for cenſuring this Omiſſion, which ſome would certainly have done, had he not had a ground for this Cenſure: which is an Argument that St. *Cyprian* himſelf had this Clauſe, and that it was not afterwards foyſted in by ſome other hand.

2. They plead, that *V.* 7. is not in the *Syriac*, nor *Arabick*, whence ſome reject the whole.

Anſ. We grant it; but *V.* 8. is in both; which is linked to *V.* 7. by a *Conjunction Copulative* [*and*]; beſide which, the *Senſe*, *Coherence* and *Dependance* of

these *with*, and *upon one another*, speak this imperfect without that. Whence *Beza* (whom *Letter* 4, p. 152 quotes on his side) saith both must be expunged, or reteined together, and then concludes for the reteining both. And indeed this Case is so clear, that since the *Socinians* receive *V.* 8. they must receive *V.* 7. too, or renounce their own reason.

We proceed to confirm the whole Verse to be authentick.

1. These words [*I and my Father are one*] are allowed on all hands to be St. *John's*; therefore those Words [*these Three are One*] from the Likeness both of Stile and Matter, seem to be his too. For such a Likeness between Text and Text, is as good an Argument (according to the proportion of Matter) to prove that each have the same Author, as it is between that Gospel and his Epistle; But all Learned Men allow of this Argument, therefore the *Socinian* must allow of that, or differ from the World of the Learned, as they do already from the World of Christians.

2. Our Learned Bishop of *Salisbury*, Dr. *Burnet*, in his Letter from *Zuric*, observes that

that among Ten Copies he had seen abroad, Nine had either the 7th *V.* or St. *Jerome's* Epistle, or Preface, which condems the Omission, while One only wanted both. Therefore among Ten Copies one only was purely *Arian*, or *Socinian*; because the Omissions in them that wanted, are condemned not only by that Epistle, or preface, but by them also who added that Epistle or Preface to those Copies.

3: Suppositions grant nothing; therefore suppose we, that this Text it self is not authentick; yet the Matter of it is taught by all those Scriptures, which assert the Divinity of the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and the Existence of but one God; for they, taken together do assert that *these Three are One*; that is, *One God*, or *One in Nature*; therefore was the *Socinian* a Man of that Reason he pretends, he could not think the expunging this Text out of the Sacred Canon, of so much moment, when divers others taken together speak the same thing. He is then imployed about a Work he can never effect; or if effected, yet can do him but little, if any service.

For which reasons they betake themselves to other Methods.

For they farther plead, *If this Text be Authentick, yet it cannot intend one in Nature, but One in Testimony, because each verse speaks of each three as Witnesses.*

Ans. True, each intend Testimony, as *Beza, Calvin, Erasmus* and others observe: But this doth not prove that *v.* 7. intends no more; nor do these Authors Exclude an Unity of Nature. But the variation of the Phrase implies a restriction of the matter. For *v.* 7. saith, *the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, are One*; which is equally extendible to Nature, and Testimony: But *v.* 8. saith, *the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, agree in One*: Which is applicable not to Nature, but to Testimony, especially where Testimony is mentioned, or evidently intended; therefore we understand the former of One in Nature, and Testimony both; else we do not take the Phrase in its full latitude, nor make it comport with those other Texts, which declare the Divine Nature of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: And yet that these three are

but

but One True, and Almighty God, becauſe that Nature is numerically one, in which they all agree: But we underſtand the latter of Teſtimony only, becauſe the phraſe deſigns no more, nor do any other Scriptures declare that the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, do agree in Nature, as the other do.

But they inſiſt thus, *The Expounding*, v. 7. *of Nature, doth loſe the deſign of theſe Texts, which ſpeak of Teſtimony.*

Anſ. The Expounding it of Nature only, excluſive of Teſtimony, would have gave ſome colour of Reaſon to his Objection: But we Expound it both of Nature, and Teſtimony too; which Expoſition doth not loſe, but ſecure the deſign of this Text. For ſince they are One in Nature, and that Nature is Divine, they muſt be One in Teſtimony, and that Teſtimony muſt be infallible too; becauſe three Divine Perſons, who are one in Nature, can neither agree in a falſe Teſtimony, nor diſagree in that Teſtimony they give.

Can we now think that this Doctrine, which teaches *there are Three, who are but one God*, is falſe, and impoſſible;

when it is so evidently founded on this, and other concurring Texts, which are the Word of Truth; and which therefore can teach nothing which is false and impossible? If any thing we teach seems absurd, and contradictory; or false and impossible (as the Letter words it) it is not from the Doctrine it self, but from the *Socinians* Misrepresentation of it. For,

1. They say we teach that *there are but One*; hereby suggesting to others, and arguing themselves, as if we mean in *One respect only*; which is indeed impossible. Whereas we teach, that *Three* in one respect are but *One* in another; which according to their own Doctrine) takes away the Impossibility. For the *Socinian* himself grants us, upon these Words, *I and my Father are One*, that *Two* in one respect may be but *One* in another: And if *Two may be One*, why not *Three*? Since the difficulty lies not between *Two* and *One*, but between a *Plurality* whether they be *Two*, or *Three*, and *an Unity*. They allow the *Being*, it is only the *Modus*, or *Manner*, how *Two*, or *Three*, can be but *One*, in which we

we differ. Therefore since we so far agree, they ought to set forth how we hold *Three to be but One*, together with our Reasons for this Doctrine; which would lead even a prejudiced Reader to some deliberation: and not by a partial and Sophistical Representation, make our Doctrine seem *prima facie*, absurd and impossible, to the end they may huff off all consideration of it.

Indeed their manner of *Union* is common among Men; but if ours is plainly founded on *Divine Revelation*, as we maintain it is, the *singularity of the thing* is not able to destroy the *Thing it self*; and therefore ought in Justice to be so proposed, as to leave Men to examine and consider it; and not to be rejected without either.

2. They say, *Let.* p. 159. we teach there are *Three Persons, who are severally, and each of them the true, and most high God*; and *yet there is but One true, and most high God.*

Ans. We teach, there *are Three Divine Persons, who together are the true and most high God.* They are every one a Divine Person, or God, as they have

every one a Divine Nature; but they are together the true and most high God; as that Divine Nature is but *One*, tho common to all *Three*. The Distinction arises from the distinct manner of Subsistence; but the Unity from the *Same-ness of Essence*. This speaks *Three that are God*, but not *Three Gods*, because these are all within the Godhead, as having but one and the same Substance; and consequently can be but One God.

3. Their Objections arise from the want of Parallel Instances in Nature; whence they speak it absurd and impossible: but the Absurdity lies on their side, who measure *Supernatural things* by *Natural*, and will believe nothing of God but what they see in the Creature; as if an *Infinite Nature* must be in all things commensurable to the Nature and Thoughts of what is *Finite*.

4. They declare it absurd and impossible, because we cannot demonstrate the *manner of it*, how *Three can be but One*; when the thing being matter of *pure Revelation* we had known nothing of it, unless it had been Revealed; and therefore now can know no more, than is re-

revealed. Now it is revealed that the *Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God; and yet theſe are not Three Gods, but One God.* But how this is, Revelation doth not tell us. Therefore we are not abſurd, who teach what the Scriptures teach; but they are abſurd in demanding more.

The Church indeed uſes the diſtinction of *Perſonal* and *Eſſential*; that they are *Three Perſonally*, and but *One Eſſentially*; that is, they are *Three Perſons*, and but *One God*. Not that theſe Terms are fully, and ſo clearly expreſſive of this Myſtery, as to remove all Cavils and Difficulties; but that ſhe may (the beſt ſhe can) expreſs her own Senſe, the Senſe of Antiquity, and the import of thoſe Scriptures that reſpect a Trinity. Let them give us more proper and ſignificant Terms, and we will uſe them; but let them not reject a Divine Truth for the ſake of thoſe Terms which Hereſie hath forced us to make uſe of.

5. This method of theirs implies a whole train of Abſurdities, for we are to prove, Firſt, [That] a thing is; and then [how] it is: If we prove the

he former, that muſt be granted, becauſe proved; though we ſhould never be able to prove the Latter. But they (contrary to all the Rules of Art, and method) require us to prove [how] it is; in order to their believing [that] it is: And do reject that part, which is proved, only becauſe the other is not. According to this method they muſt deny a thouſand things, which they ſee, which all Mankind will ſay is abſurd with a witneſs.

They ſay p. 158, *that Interpretation of Scripture can never be true, that holds forth either a Doctrine, or a Conſequence, that is abſurd, contradictory, or Impoſſible.*

Anſ. We readily grant it, and ſuch is that of the Anthropomorphites mentioned in the next Page. For God is a Spirit, but not a Body: Becauſe body is compounded of parts, is ſubject to Diſſolution, and cannot be in all places at once; therefore thoſe Scriptures, which aſcribe humane parts to God, cannot be true in a literal ſenſe; but only in an improper one.

And

And when these Men have proved such an absurdity, contradiction, or impossibility in the Doctrine of a Trinity, we will dispute no more.

They may indeed prove that three Men cannot be one; or one Man three; but as the Learned Bishop of *Worcester*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, observes, they can never prove that an infinite Nature cannot communicate it self to three different Subsistences, without such a division as is among created Beings: Because a Finite capacity can never comprehend the Powers, and Operations of an infinite Nature. So absurd are these Men as to decry revealed Truths for absurd, and impossible, only because they cannot understand them. Should they do the like in natural things, they would quickly become the contempt of Mankind.

We are not ashamed to own a Mystery in the Divine Nature, when we find little but Mystery in common Nature her self. Nor can we think it unreasonable that God should command us to believe that a thing is; though he hath not told us how it is;

any

any more than it is unreasonable that Nature should oblige us to assent, where the most refined reason can find no place of Entrance. God hath revealed so much as is fit for us to know; and ignorance is neither a Sin, nor a Reproach, where he hath not instructed us.

But we must declare it not absurd only, but blasphemous too, to deny what God hath told us, only because he hath not told us more; or not baffled our Cavils by a demonstration; as if, they dare not believe him any farther than they can see. A right *Nicodemus* temper, which stumbles at Divine Truths only with an —*How can these things be?*

Sect. 6.

From their Reasonable Faith he proceeds to complement its professors for *Learned, and Reasonable Men*: *Which* (he saith) *is their Character among their worst Adversaries.*

Ans.

Anſ. We do not envy what Learning, and Reaſon they are thought to have: But we charge them with the abuſe of both. Their Guilt this way will eaſily appear to any, that can but underſtand an Author; their Arguments being fallacious, and their Quotations falſe. But as for this Epiſtler (poor Man) though we cannot admire his Talents, yet we muſt declare he miſimploys that little he hath. This will abundantly appear as from what he hath done, ſo likewiſe from his Hiſtory of the *Sorinians*, which we now proceed to.

For p. 26. thus, *thoſe, whom we call* Socinians, *were by the Fathers, and firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, called* Nazarens, *by which name St.* Paul *is accuſed before* Felix, *Acts* 29. 5.

Anſ. A Chriſtian ſignifies a Diſciple of Chriſt; and *Nazaren* in this place a Diſciple of Jeſus of *Nazareth*: And did then denote not a Party, but the whole Body of Chriſtians: So *Epiphanius adv. Hær. l.* 1. to 2. *Hær.* 29 πάντες δὲ οἱ χριστιανοὶ Ναζωραῖοι τότε ἐκαλοῦντο, all Chriſtians were then called *Nazarens*; and that

that by way of contempt from the *Jews*, as they afterwards were *Galileans* by the Apoſtate.

They are indeed branded for a Sect in the place quoted, but not as a party broke off from the body of Chriſtians, but as the Church of Chriſt now ſeparated from the *Jews*. I beſeech you then what peculiar honour, and advantage can the *Socinians* claim to themſelves from hence, was the thing they plead true, when, as Chriſtians, they have this honour, but in common with others; and, as *Sorinians*, can pretend to but one of the ſmalleſt ſhares of it?

The ſame Father, *c.* 7. tells us of a Sect of *Nazarens*, even before the Incarnation, tho indeed *Petavius* rejects the Account; nor can I ſee any ſufficient grounds for it; but however I mention it to pleaſure our *Socinians*, who are ſeeking a Pedigree. Therefore take it thus, ſome of theſe (he ſaith) profeſſed Chriſt, but denied his Divinity; in other things they were *Jews* ſtill: for they obſerved Circumciſion, the Sabbath, and other Ceremonies; and therefore ſtood diſtinct

bo

both from Jews and Christians. Whence *Jerom. Epist. ad Aug.* gives this Character of 'em; *viz.* they are called *Minæans*, or *Nazarens*; *sed dum Volunt & Judæi esse, & Christiani; nec Judæi sunt, nec Christiani*; *While they would pass both for Jews and Christians, they are neither.* And if these Men will claim from hence, you have in them this Character of a *Socinian*, That *he is one who is neither Jew nor Christian.* Hence I suppose this Epistler is none of the Reasonable, or Learned among them, since he hath mentioned this either to no purpose, or to his own disadvantage.

He there saith, they were also called *Ebionites.*

Ans. These were of two sorts, *Euseb. Hist. l.* 3. *c.* 27. the one held, that Christ was born of *Joseph* and *Mary*; the other of the *Holy Ghost*, and *the Virgin.* But both observed Jewish Rites, and rejected St. *Paul's* Epistles, calling him an *Apostate.* They received no Gospel but St. *Matthew*, and that mutilated too: *Epiphan. adv. Hær. l.* 1. *to* 2. *Hær.* 30. which *Petavius* observes was depraved by them, and was the same with the Gospel to the

He-

Hebrews, which was uſed by none but Hereticks. *Orig. cont. Celſ. l.* 5. ſaith, they teach the Law, and reject the Epiſtles of *St. Paul.* And *Optat. Mileu. l.* 4. they held it was not the *Son*, but the *Father* that ſuffered.

They were theſe Men who troubled the *Apoſtles*, and drew their Diſciples back to *Moſaic Rites*, under *Menander*, *Cerinthus*, and others, whoſe Hereſy was ſubſtantially the ſame for divers Ages. Whence St. *Paul* brands them for *Falſe Brethren*, *Gal.* 2. 4. elſewhere for *corrupters of the Word*; *and ſuch as lie in wait to deceive.* This was the Reaſon they rejected his Epiſtles, becauſe he ſo conſtantly cenſures them. And *Ebion* himſelf was branded by all Antiquity for one of the *Gnoſtic* Hereticks, *Tertul. de Præſ. Hær. c.* 33.

Yet our *Socinian* Author makes himſelf, and Party, the ſame with theſe! No matter what poyſon men ſuck in, ſo they deny the *Divinity of Chriſt*! This one Bleaſphemy ſanctifies all! By this Rule they are the ſame with *Simon Magus*, the *Father of Hereticks*; and with the *Devil*, the *Father of Lies*; for they both denied

ed the *Divinity of the Son*; the one in making himself a Saviour, the other in tempting him; excepting this, that the Devil afterwards confessed this Truth, which the *Socinian* still denies. An hopeful Brood indeed, that *Glories in such Fathers*.

He proceeds, *the Socinians were also called, Artemonites, Theodotians, Symmachians, Paulinists, Samosatenians, Photinians*, and *Monarchians*.

Ans. Grant this, and it must be granted too, that as these Men were always condemned for *Hereticks*, so the *Socinians* were always condemned in them. And strange it is they should always be in the right, and yet be always condemned for it?

They were called *Artemonites, Photinians*, &c. to signifie they were the *Followers*, not of *Christ*, but of *Artemon, Photinus*, &c. And did the *Socinians* seriously reflect upon their *Blasphemies*, and their *palpable Corruptions* both of the *Letter* and *Sense* of the Sacred Scriptures, as well as of *all Antiquity*; it nearly concerns them to consider how far this is applicable to themselves; that is, in plain *Eng-*

lish, whether the Name [*Socinian*] doth not better ſuit them than that of [*Chriſtian*.]

The *Monarchians* boaſted, that they held the World was governed by a *Monarchy*; that is, *by One God*, in oppoſition to *the Orthodox*, who (they ſay) introduced *Three Gods*, by the Doctrine of a *Trinity*. Whence I grant, that theſe, and our *Socinians* are Men of the ſame *Pride* and *Falſhood*.

In anſwer to whom *the Orthodox* always declared (as we do) that they held no other than a Monarchy, and that the Doctrine of a Trinity is no way contradictory to this. For when ſome in *Tertullian adv. Prax. c.* 3. cried, *Monarchiam tenemus*; *We profeſs but One God*: he proves, that the *Orthodox*, or (if he will) *the Trinitarians*, did hold but *One God* too: for Proof of which he argues, *c.* 4. that *he deduces the Son from the Subſtance of the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt from both*; which doth no way deſtroy, but (as he there pleads) confirms a Monarchy; for being *all Three* but of *One Subſtance*, or *Nature*, they can be *all Three but One God*.

Upon

Upon the same bottom the most strenuous asserters of a *Trinity* did ever maintain this Doctrine. *Athanas. To. 1. cont. Ari. Ora.* 5 declares, that the Government of the World is Μοναρχία, by but One God. *Greg. Naz.* who triumphed over *Eunomius*, *Ora.* 35. observes, that there are *Three Opinions* about God, ἀναρχία, πολυαρχία, and Μοναρχία; *Anarchy*, which (with *Epicurus*) denies *the Divine Government*; *Polyarchy*, which (with the rest of the *Gentiles*) asserts its Government by many Gods; and *Monarchy*, which is by but One God. The two first (he saith) introduce Confusion, while the last only can keep the World in Order. And *Euseb. de Eccles. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 11. observes, that tho the Church teaches that Form (meaning in the *Nicene Creed*) *God of God*, yet she designs hereby not *Two Gods*, but *Two persons in the Godhead.*

Now had these *Socinians* first destroyed this Notion, by proving that a *Trinity* must import, not *Three persons in the Godhead*, but *Three Gods*; and then valued themselves upon these Names of *Monarchians*, and *Unitarians*, they had

acted like Men: But their insisting upon these terms without disproving our Doctrine, speaks them as wretched as their Cause; the one Barren, the other Blind, since both are forced to call in exploded Cavils to support them.

Hence he proceeds to Glory in some Men of Name among them, as *Theodotion* and *Symmathus, both of whom Translated the Old Testament into Greek, and by* Eusebius *are called* Ebionites, *or* Nazarens.

Ans. Eusebius speaks them *Ebionites*, but not a word there of a *Nazaren*; under which name he vainly strives to sweeten himself, and Party; that they might seem to appear with some little face of honest Christianity.

We acknowledg their Translation of the *Old Testament*, but being branded for *Ebionites*, we must presume they denied great part of the *New*: As for *Symmathus*, he is expressly said to reject the Gospel of *St. Matthew*. Therefore since our *Socinians* so passionately desire to pass for *Ebionites*, that I may gratify 'em what I can; I grant 'em there is one good reason why it should be

be ſo, and that is, as the *Ebionites* reject ſome parts of Scripture, and corrupt others; ſo do the *Socinians* too; and now at length ſcoff at the Divine Authority of the Whole. The matter is too plain to be denied; I have ſometimes heard it my ſelf, and know of perſons that complain of ſome under their charge, that are debauched in their Principles and Manners by ſuch Doctrines. But whether theſe are the ſtrict ſort of *Socinians*, or *Socinians* at large, *viz. Atheiſts* and *Deiſts* that now heard among them, I think they ought to acquaint us.

But let old *Theodotion*, and *Symmachus* be what they will, what is the Glory of having theſe two on their ſide, when the whole Church was againſt them? It muſt be a miſerable Crap, where ſuch gleanings are their Vintage.

But they have a third, it ſeems, *Paulus* of *Samaſatum*, p. 27. *a Man both Learned and Eloquent.*

Anſ. He did indeed deny the Divinity of the Son, which is the only thing (it ſeems) that makes him great and good. For *Euſebius* H. l. 7. c. 27. and

the Synodical Letter, c. 30. say, *He had neither Wealth, nor Learning, but made himself vastly rich by Sacriledg, and Oppression. His Pride was unmeasurable, he walked the Streets with Guards — He abolished the Psalms Sung in Honour of our Saviour, and had others Sung in praise of himself. He incouraged, and protected the Wicked, gaining to his side the worst of men*

Prateolus (among other things) saith, He was proud and simple. He taught that Christ was more for the *Jewish* than the *Christian Religion*; whence he taught Circumcision: Of a Beggar he became Rich by Sacriledg, Oppression and Knavery.

These are the Characters of an Heretic, which neither himself nor Friends could ever Answer, and whom the vilest object would blush to own, unless a *Socinian*, who would fain Adorn themselves with this mans Glories; like the wild Savages, who dressed up themselves with the guts of Beasts.

His next man is *Photinus* of *Sirmium*, *who being deposed by the Council, his City would*

would not part from him, till the Emperor sent an Army to Expel him.

Anſ. 1. *Praleonus*, *Hær l.* 14. 25. ſaith, *Photinus* held that Chriſt was a mere Man, *Ex utroq; ſexu natum*, born of both Sexes; but this the *Socinians* deny, for they hold he was Born of the Holy Ghoſt, and of the Virgin; therefore this letter is falſe in reckning *Photinus* one of them.

2. But however an Heretick he was, and therefore a Party with the *Socinians*; and (it ſeems) ſo dear to his City, that the Emperor was obliged to Expel him by an Army. Suppoſe it; yet had this man conſidered how often *Conſtantius* impoſed his *Arian* Creatures by Force and ſometimes Eſtabliſhed 'em by Blood; he muſt have expected to loſe more than he thought to have gained by this Plea.

3. This is an Appeal from the Government both Civil, and Eccleſiaſtical to the Mob; an Argument that his Hereſie had left him but few, if any Friends of Senſe and Judgment.

He proceeds to *Euſebius*, H. l. 5. c. 28 and *Theodoret. Hær. Fab.* c. 2. *de Artem.* And pretends, they ſay, that theſe *Nazarens conſtantly affirmed, that they derived their Doctrine from the Apoſtles,— And that it was the general Doctrine of the Church, till the Popes*, Victor *and* Zepherine, *ſet themſelves to root it up.*

Anſ. Neither of theſe in the places quoted, mention a *Nazaren*. But the Hereſie of *Arlemon*, renewed by *Paulus Samoſatenſis* who taught that Chriſt is no more than Man.

Euſebius ſaith indeed, there were ſome who affirmed that all the Antients, and the Apoſtles themſelves, taught this Doctrine, and that it continued till *Victor* and *Zepherine*. But he calls hi an impiouſe Lye, and proceeds, *Perhaps this might ſeem credible, did not the ſacred Scriptures, and the Writings of certain Brethren, more Antient than* Victor, *contradict them; I mean* Juſtin, Miltiades, Fatian, Clemens *and many others, in all whoſe Books the Divinity of Chriſt is taught. For who knows not the Writings of* Irenæus, Melito, *&c. in which Chriſt is ſet forth as both God and Man?*

The

The Pſalms and Canticles of the Brethren written ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, *from the beginning— aſcribe a Divinity to him. Seeing then this was ſo long ſince the Doctrine of the Church, how can it be, that all men to the time of* Victor *could teach that Doctrine which theſe men hold?*——

Theodoret, in the place cited, ſaith, that *Artemon* pretended the Apoſtles taught that Chriſt was a mere Man, προστεμνόντων τῶν θείων γραφῶν τὴν διάνοιαν. Perverting the ſenſe of the Sacred Scriptures. This exactly agrees with that of *Euſebius* Therefore this Letter wiſely refers us to thoſe very places of Antiquity, which declare that Doctrine to be Hereſie, and condemn the Maintainers of it of Falſhood and Impudence, which yet it ſelf would ſupport. He told us the *Socinians* are Learned and Reaſonable Men, but I hope this is not one of his Proofs of it.

However, the *Letter* proceeds, *Victor (ſay the Socinians) began to perſecute the Apoſtolic Doctrine of One God, or (which is the ſame) that God is One in the Year* 194 *but with little ſucceſs, till that which*

was

was afterwards the Doctrine of the Arians, *grew into general credit*; ——— *for* Juſtin Martyr, Origen, *and other principal Fathers, teaching (as the* Arians *afterwards did) that the Father is before the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, in Time, Dignity, and Power; yet that the Word, or Son,* ——— *was created ſometime before the World,*—*and that the Holy Ghoſt was the Creature of the Son.*

Anſ. The *Letter* tells us, *That the* Socinians *ſay this*; and indeed it may paſs for a *Socinian Story*; for it hath not one Word of Truth in it. For,

1. The Doctrine of *One God*, or that God *is One*; that is, *One perſon*, as they explain it, never was the Apoſtolic Doctrine, as *Euſebius*, now quoted by himſelf, doth declare, both from the Scriptures, and from the moſt ancient *Fathers*, as well as from *the Hymns* compoſed in honour of Chriſt, from the beginning of *the Goſpel.*

2. The Doctrine of *One God*, or that *God is One*; that is, not *One perſon excluſive of other perſons*, but *One God excluſive of other Gods*, was the Doctrine of the Apoſtles and Apoſtolic Men, appears

pears from the same place in *Eusebius*, and from all the same Topicks already mentioned.

3. That *Victor* did *persecute*, and *root out the Heresie he contends for*, doth not appear from any Monuments of those times, nor is in any reason to be supposed, because that *Heresie* had not then obtained in that Church; and what he did was only (according to the common Rules, and Practice of the Church) to quash this *Heresie* in its beginning.

4. The *Letter* makes it, that that pretended Persecutition did little succeed, till it was assisted by the Doctrine of *Justin Martyr*, and *Origen*, which supposes that their Doctrine began under that Persecution, which is impossible: for this Persecution (the *Letter* saith) began *A.D.* 194. but *Justin* suffered about 30 years before that time, and *Origen* did not appear till the middle of the Age after. And,

5. Neither these, nor any other *Fathers*, from the Apostles, to *Origen*, did ever teach any such Doctrine, which might be easily proved by an induction of Particulars, so far as their Works are come down to our hands.

Justin

Justin Martyr saith indeed, *Apol. p. 60.* that beside the *Father*, we worship *the Son*, ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ, in the second place; and the *Holy Ghost*, ἐν τῇ τάξει, in the third. Now here is a Priority of Order or Place; but where is that of Time and Power? Not in this *Father*, I am sure, but in the *Socinian Comment* only. We charge him with *Falshood*; let him clear himself by *a particular Reference.*

What *Justin* here saith, ever was, and still is the Doctrine of the Church. So *Novat. de Trin. c.* 31. *Pater qua pater*—— *the Father*, as *Father*, is before *the Son*, and yet he declares, that *the Son is co-eternal* and *co-essential* with *the Father*; which speaks (as we said) a Priority of Order or Place, but not of Time, because *the Father* and *Son are co-eternal.*

This must necessarily be the Sense of our *Justin*; for in the same Apology, *p.* 64. he saith, θεὸν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν· We worship God only. Wence any Man in his Wits must conclude, that they held, that *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost are God*; Else how could they worship all *Three*, and yet worship *none but God?* And if *they are God*, they cannot be after the *Father*,

ther, in Time, or Power, but muſt be *co-eternal*, and *co-equal* with him.

Had *Juſtin* taught, that *the Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt* are after the Father in time, and yet had worſhipp'd them, he would hereby have totally ruin'd the very Reaſon, and Deſign of this, as well as of other Apologies; which were purpoſely written to juſtifie the Chriſtians, who ſuffered any thing rather than worſhip the *Gentile* Gods, for this very Reaſon, that they were not from Eternity, and conſequently were not Gods, but Creatures. Our *Socinian* (it ſeems) thinks it enough to Name an Author, tho he can find nothing in him to his purpoſe; having neither Authority, nor Argument for what he ſaith.

Iren. l. 3. *c.* 26. Indeavours to prove that the Son is God by Nature, and after ſome time ſpent on this Argument, thus *diligenter, igitur ſignifiravit Spiritus Sanctus, per ea quæ dicta ſunt, generationem ejus quæ ex Virgine, & ſubſtatiam quoniam deus.* The bleſſed Spirit diligently ſignifies by what things are ſpoken, his Generation, which is of the Virgin, and his ſubſtance as he

is

is God. By his Generation he intends his humane Nature, and by his Substance as God the Divine. This (he ſaith) is expreſſed, *Iſa.* 7. 14. by that word [*Immanuel*] God with us, or God in our Nature. He proceeds; his humanity appears from his eating Butter, and Hony, and his Divinity from his chooſing the good, and refuſing the Evil, *v.* 15. This laſt (he ſaith) is added, leaſt by his eating Butter, and Hony, *nude ſolummodo eum hominem intelligeremus*, we ſhould think he is merely Man: And again the Word [*Immanuel*] intimates that we cannot ſee God in his own Nature, but as he is manifeſted in our's. It is therefore impoſſible that *Irenæus* ſhould hold that the Son is God as to Title, or Office only, as the *Arians* afterwards did; when he ſo plainly teaches that he underſtood him to be God in the *Trinitarian* ſenſe, and that is in Subſtance, or Nature.

This ſhows what ſenſe we are to take him in, *l.* 1. *c.* 2. where he lays down this as one Article in the Chriſtian Faith, that Chriſt is Lord, and God; which

which Faith (he ſaith) the Church throughout the World received, παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθητῶν From the Apoſtles, and Apoſtolic Men: And c. 3. this Faith the Church keeps as if ſhe had but one Soul, and but one Heart; where obſerve

1. That [God] muſt here ſignifie God by Nature, or Subſtance, becauſe he ſo explained himſelf in the place before quoted.

2. It is impoſſible that the Doctrine againſt the Divinity of the Son could be the Doctrine of the Church from the Apoſtles to *Victor*; when the Deity of the Son was the Doctrine of the whole Church from the Apoſtles to *Irenæus*; who was cotemporary with *Victor*, as appears from the Fragments of his Epiſtle to this *Victor* himſelf in *Euſeb. H. l.* 5. *c.* 24.

Clemens of *Alexandria*, who flouriſhed under *Victor*, and *Zepherine* both, is as clear in this matter, as Pen can write, for he not only ſaith *adm. ad Gent.* that Chriſt is Θεὸς τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος both God and Man; and *Paed. l.* 2. he is θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις χήμασι. which I can render

render no better than in the Words of the Apoſtle, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *God manifeſt in the Fleſh*, but he alſo aſcribes thoſe things to the Son, which all Men muſt grant us, can be true of none, but God: For *Strom. l.* 7. the Son is ὁ μεριζόμενος *indiviſible, removes not from place to place; but is in all places, but is contained in none.* Again he is ὅλος νοῦς all Mind, all Eye, beholding all things. This ſufficiently proves *Clemens* no *Arian*, ſince he ſo manifeſtly declares the Divine nature of the Son.

Strom. l. 5. he Collects certain Notions out of *Plato*, which (he ſaith) can ſignify nothing elſe, but τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα. the Holy Trinity. For he puts the Father as the cauſe of all things, then deſcends to δεύτερον περὶ τὰ δευτερα, and to τρίτον περὶ τὰ τρίτα· a ſecond, who is converſant about ſecond things, and to a third, who is imployed about third things; he ſeems to underſtand by the former the Son, who continues; and by the latter the Holy Ghoſt, who finiſhes things. This (he ſaith) *Plato* had from the *Hebrews*; which Argument he abounds in, pleading that the

Geu-

Gentiles had their choiceſt Notions from the *Jews* mediately, or immediately.

But whether this was the ſenſe of *Plato* or not; is totally foraign from my Argument. It is enough to me that this Father is ſo far from being either *Arian* or *Socinian*, that he looked upon the Doctrine of a Trinity as ſo plain a Truth, that he thought an Heathen could ſpell it out of the Old-Teſtament.

Tertullian wrote under *Zepherine*, if not under *Victor* too; and yet *adv. Prax. c.* 2. ſaith, the *Divinity of the Son was taught from the beginning*: and what he underſtands by his Divinity, himſelf explains c. 3. where he declares that the *Son is of the ſame Subſtance with the Father.*

Theſe are moſt undenyable Proofs of the ſhameleſs impudence of this Letter, which will have all the principle Fathers of thoſe times to be Patrons of the *Arian* Hereſy.

As for *Origen*, he not only lived in the Age after *Victor*, but alſo upon *Revel.* 1. 8. *I am Alpha, and Omega, the firſt, and the laſt,* ——— *the Almighty*;

doth declare that in these words St. *John* asserts the Divinity of the Son.

These things so totally ruine this part of the Letter, which would have *Arianism* the swaying Religion of those times, that I should perswade my self they would never more offer these falshoods to the World; did I not find, they have the Confidence to revive old rotten Heresies; and both to adorn, and support their own by them, who were the worst of Men, as well as the most erroneous of Christians.

However the Letter proceeds p. 28, 29 *this Doctrine being advanced by Justin, Origen, and others, became the more currant Doctrine of the Church, till in the Council of Nice it was Condemned, and another more popular (and so more taking) than that (as attributing to the Son Eternity, and Equality with the Father) did generally obtain.*

Ans. As *Justin*, *Origen*, and others of Note in the Church (as the Letter speaks) never taught any such Doctrine; so the Council of *Nice* did Establish no other, but what had always been the Doctrine of the Church, accor-

cording to that of *Athanaſius de Synod. Nicæn. decret.* ἣν ἡ σύνοδος ἐγγράφως ὁμολογησε τοῖς, αὕτη τῆς καθολικῆς ἐστὶ the Faith Eſtabliſhed at *Nice*, is the Faith of the Catholick Church. What this Father ſaith, we may eaſily prove both as to the Doctrine it ſelf, and alſo as to the terms, that expreſs it.

1. The Doctrine Eſtabliſhed at *Nice* is this, that the Son is of the ſame Subſtance, Eſſence, or nature with the Father; and therefore is properly God as the Father is; but that this was always the Doctrine of the Church, is ſufficiently evident from what we have already cited from *Juſtin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, and *Tertullian*. To whom I ſhall add *Ignatius*, who was cotemporary with the Apoſtles.

That his Epiſtles are Genuine, is acknowledged by their beloved *Sandius*; and is Proved by Doctor *Peirſon* againſt *Daillé*, even to the ſhame of all future doubts, and oppoſition. Theſe often ſtile the Son God, *Epiſt. ad Smyr.* begins thus, δοξάζω Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν τὸν θεὸν *I glorifie Jeſus Chriſt, who is God.* And

p. 7. *Vos. Edit.* he asserts the Divinity again. But I refer the Reader to one Place, which can never be evaded by any *Arian*, or *Socinian* Artifice; and that in his *Epist. ad Ephes.* there is εἷς ἰατρὸς, σαρκικὸς τε καὶ πνευματικὸς, γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος· ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θ. Θεὸς ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινὴ καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας, καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ πρῶτον παθητὸς, καὶ τότε ἀπαθὴς. In which words the Author doth distinguish between the Humane and Divine Nature of Christ; for he is Carnal and Spiritual; of *Mary* and of *God*; he is *begotten* and *unbegotten*; i. e. *begotten as Man*, and *unbegotten as God*: For his *Eternal Generation* respects not his *Nature*, by which he is God, but his *Person*, by which he is the Son of God. Again, he is *passible*, and *impassible*; that is, *passible*, as Man; so not only his Body was pierced, and crucified; but *Mat.* 26. 38. his Soul was περίλυπος, *exceeding sorrowful*; or *encompassed round with Sorrows*; whence proceeded his Agonies and Bloody Sweat: therefore he is *Impassible* only as God. This (I think) considered together with the whole Quotation,

tation, demonstrates, that it is the Design of this Author to assert the Divine Nature of Christ, because nothing but that can be *Unbegotten*, and *Impassible*.

2. The Terms in which this Council doth assert the Divine Nature of the Son, are, that the Son is ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ, consubstantial, or of the same substance with *the Father*; but this was no invention of that Council. For *Iren.* l. 3. c. 26. but now quoted, saith, that his generation of the Virgin speaks him man; but his substance speaks him God: And if so, he must be God in substance; and if God in substance, he must be of the same substance with the *Father*; because there can be but one Divine Substance, Essence, or Nature; as there is but One God.

Tertullian is more large in this Point; for *adv. Prax.* c. 2. and 3. he expressly saith, that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are *Three*; ——— *non substantia*, not in Substance; that is, they are not substantially distinct; but they are *Unius substantiæ*, of one, and therefore of the same Substance. Now, I pray, what is the difference between the Father and the Son's being *Unius substantiæ*, of

our Substance; and between the Son's being (in the Phrase of *Nice*) ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ consubstantial with the Father? Even none. For he that is consubstantial with another, must be of the same substance with that other.

In the same place the same Father varies the Phrase, but keeps to the matter; saying, that he deduces the Son *de Substantia Patris*, from the Substance of the Father; which implies what is imported by the two other Phrases. And this (he saith) was taught *ab initio Evangelii*, from the beginning of the Gospel. Therefore the *Nicene* Council did determine no more in this particular, than what was taught by the Church, even from the beginning of the Church it self.

So plain is it, that the *Nicene* Fathers did neither invent any New Terms, nor impose any New Doctrine; but did only declare and confirm that which was the Doctrine of the Church from the Apostles themselves. This gives Credit to not only what we have quoted from *Athanasius* already, but also to that Passage in his Epistle *ad Epis. in Afric.* that *the Bishop of* Rome *and* Alexandria, *did from an hundred and thirty years since* condemn

demn those who denied that the Son is of the same Substance with the Father.

But the *Arian* Doctrine, which teaches, that *the Son was indeed before the World, but not from Eternity*; and that *there was a Time in which the Son was not*, is no where found in the First Ages of the Church; but was condemned as a New Monster in Religion in the Fourth. So *Athanas. cont. Ari. Ora.* 2. τις ἤκουσε —— who hath heard such things as these? And τὸ μὴ ἐκ παλέρων, ἀλλὰ νῦν ἐφευρεθὲν. This is not from the Fathers, but is of Yesterday. And *Hilar. Pict. Episc. ad Constant. August. l.* it is *novella lues*, a *New Pest*; a Pest that hath no mote of Antiquity, than of Truth to sweeten it.

And indeed it was not any of the ancient Fathers (as this *Letter* falsly pretends), but *Arius*, a Presbyter of *Alexandria*, in the 4*th* Age of the Church, that invented that *Heresie*, from whom it took the Name of *Arianism*. As he was the first, who in this way sought to undermine, and subvert the Divinity of the Son, so he had somewhat a like *Exit* with *Judas*, who betrayed him. For as this Traytor burst asunder, and his Bowels gushed out; so this *Heretic*, presently

ly upon his Perjury, whereby he would seem to abjure, but still retain the Poyson of his *Heresie*, voided his bowels in a *common Jakes*.

This was thought a Warning-Piece to the *Arians* then; and ought to be considered by the *Socinians* now; since they have improved this *Heresie*, as the *Pharisees* did their Proselytes, by making it sevenfold more the Child of Hell than it was; it being in some degrees more gross, daring, and anti-scriptural; and carried on by no less Falshood, Treachery, and Wickedness than the other; excepting the Formality of an Oath, and that Blood, and Tortures, which these Men have not the power of.

The Letter proceeds, p. 29. *But did Superstition stop here? No. For there shortly arose another Doctrine, that the Son and Holy Ghost, are the same God with the Father, not only (as the* Nicene *Fathers explained the Matter) by Unity of Wills, and specifick Identity, or sameness of Substance, but by numerical, or true Identity, and sameness of Substance and Nature.*

An

Anſ. 1. This Council did intend a numerical Unity, or ſameneſs of Subſtance that there might be no room left for any Cavils about three Gods.

2. The Church was ſo far from any new Doctrine, that that Age, as well as the next did celebrate this Creed as the ſtanding Rule of Faith to all the Churches. *Epiphan. adv. Her. l* 2. to c. *Her.* 72. calls it ἐκκλησιαστικὸν πίστις *the Eccleſiaſtical Rule of Faith. Greg. Nyſ.* to 2. *cart. Eunom. l.* 1. in our Creed there is ἡ τῷ ὁμοούσιῳ λέξις the word *conſubſtantial*, which muſt be the Creed of *Nice*, and yet this is *Ours*. *Baſil* to 3 Epiſtle 6. recites this, and calls it the Creed παρ' ὑμῖν, in uſe with you. *Ambroſ. de fid. l.* 1. *c.* 8, 9. quotes part of this Creed about the Conſubſtantiality, and then ſaith, this is the *Doctrine of the Church*, which anathematizes them that teach otherwiſe. And *Evag. H. l* 3. c. 17. this was uſed in Baptiſm then, as the Creed called the Apoſtles is now with us; and was confirmed by the next General Council at *Conſtantinople*.

They

They all kept up to this Rule, and intended the ſame thing; though they did not all agree in the manner of explaining, and proving it. What room then there could be here left for any new Doctrine ſoon after this Council at *Nice*, I am yet to learn.

Sect. 7.

Hence he proceeds to ſome Eminent Authors, who (the Letter ſaith) *are either* Arian *or* Socinian.

1. Eraſmus *is thought an* Arian, p. 31. to coulour which pretence, he quoates him upon *Philip.* 2. 6. and *Epheſ.* 5. 5.

Anſ. The former Text, he thinks, doth reſpect not his Nature, but the manner of his appearance and behaviour: But yet he grants us that Chriſt is God, though he thinks this Text doth not prov it. And on *Epheſ* 5. 5. *the Kingdom of God, and of Chriſt*: he declares that theſe words do not deny the Divinity of the Son.

But

But had this Letter purſued Truth, and not the ſupport of an Error, it would likewiſe have told the Reader, that upon *John* 1. 1. *The Word was God*; he aſſerts that there is *Divinam Eſſentiam tribus perſonis Communem*; a Divine Eſſence common to three Perſons: Which is all we contend for, and which alone ſpeaks *Eraſmus* himſelf as true a *Trinitarian*, as the Author of the *Athanaſian* Creed.

His Paraphraſe upon this clauſe [in the beginning was the Word] ſaith, the Eternal Word was with the Eternal Father] yet by the *Word* he underſtands not the Command, Power or Wiſdom of God, but a Perſon, as appears from the laſt quotation before this; and conſequently he here aſſerts both the Perſonality, and Eternity of the Word, which is the very Doctrine we teach.

John 8. 5, 8. *before* Abraham *was*, I am, he renders, *Priuſquam naſceretur*, before *Abraham* was born; to the end he might diſtinguiſh (as he ſaith himſelf) the manner of *Abraham's* Exiſtence from Chriſt's, *Abraham* was in time,

time, but [*semper est Christus*] Christ is always; which directly contradicts both the *Socinian*, who denies Christs Existence before his Incarnation; and also the *Arian*, who denies his Existence from Eternity. Upon these words he quotes *St. Austin*, who glosses thus, *Abraham was made*, but Christ *is*; that denotes a Creature, this a being Eternally existing.

It is plain then that *Erasmus* taught a Trinity. And certainly he would not think that the *ignorant, and dull side of the question* (as the Letter speaks) which he teaches for Orthodox Divinity. All the difference between him and ourselves is this; that we agree in the same Doctrine, but differ only in some of those Mediums that should prove it. For which reason he ought to be read with caution and judgment.

The Letter saith that this Author in his *Scholia* on the third tome of *St. Jerom's* Epistles, *denies that the Arians are Heretick's*.

Ans. Had he told us upon what Epistle these *Scholia* are, we might have examined the place without much

much loss of time: But I presume, he thinks himself safe under so loose a Reference, hoping none will turn over a Volume to disprove him.

In his Epistle to *Bilibaldus* thus, *I* (saith *Erasmus*) *could be of the Arian perswasion, if the Church approved it.*

Ans. The Author thus, *cum Arianis, & Pelagianis sentire possim, si probasset ecclesia quod illi docuerunt: Nec mihi non sufficiunt verba Christi, sed mirum videri non debet, si sequor interpretem Ecclesiam, cujus Authoritate persuasus credo Scripturis Canonicis. I could be of the same mind with the* Arians, *and* Pelagians, *if the Church had approved what they taught: Not that the words of Christ do not satisfy me, but it ought not to seem strange, if I follow the Judgement of the Church, by whose Authority I believe the Canonical Scripture*, which place is certainly against him: For

1. He saith the words of Christ do satisfie him, *i. e.* as to *Arianism*, and *Pelagianism*, before mentioned.

2. He puts *Arianism*, and *Pelagianism* together, implying that he had no more favour for that, than for this; which

which I do not remember he was ever charged with. Therefore

3. His design is not to favour this, or t'other Heresy, but only to shew how far he could give up his Faith to the Judgment of the Church: And consequently his own sense must be much distant from both these Perswasions, else this could be no Argument of his wonderful submission to the Churches Authority.

A *Romanist* may make good advantage of this, and therefore the *Paris* Doctors never put it among their Censures: But it no more helps the *Socinian*, than the things he calls his Arguments, and Demonstrations.

He proceeds p. 31. *Grotius is Socinian all over*, and p. 32. *there is nothing in all his Annotations which they*, viz. the *Socinians*, *do not approve, and applaud.*

Ans. Upon *Joh.* 1. 1. these words [in the beginning] *Grotius* will have to be taken from *Gen.* 1. 1. and understands them of the Creation properly, or of the beginning of the Creature: As he doth also *v.* 2. [by him were all things made.] For which he quotes the

Epistle

Epiſtle of *Barnabas*, *Juſtin*, *Athenagoras*, *Tatian*, *Tertullian*, and others.

This word [was] he renders *jam tum erat*, then was, or did exiſt, when all Creatures began: By which Exiſtence before time he underſtands an Eternal Exiſtence: And yet he holds the [Word] or Son not for the Command or ſimple Power of God, but for a Perſon. Where obſerve that *Grotius* teaches that the Son is a Perſon eternally exiſting, who (in a proper ſenſe) made, or created the World, and if either *Arian* or *Socinian* approve, or applaud this they muſt each depart from his own Hereſy.

Therefore when upon thoſe words, *Coloſ.* 1. 16. *by him*; *viz.* the Son; as *Grotius* himſelf takes it, were all things, ἐκτίσθη [created]; he ſaith, this word is ſometimes applied to the New Creature; we muſt underſtand him, as ſhewing the Various Acceptations of the word, not as deſigning hereby to deny the Son to be Creator, becauſe he ſo expreſly aſcribes Creation to him upon that Text of St. *John*,

3. In

3. In p. 32. he pretends, that *Petavius* grants, *that the Fathers before the* Nicene *Council, did agree in their Doctrine concerning God, with the* Socinian, *and concerning the Son, and Holy Spirit, with the* Arians.

Anſ. 1. *Petavius* ſaith no ſuch thing. Let the *Socinian* vindicate himſelf, by referring us to the places.

2. Had he ſaid ſo, the Quotations we have given the Reader out of *Ignatius, Juſtin, Irenæus, Clemens, Tertullian*, and others, would abundantly confute him.

3. *Petavius* himſelf was a *Trinitarian*, as appears from what he hath wrote upon this Argument. And,

4. He did not accuſe theſe Fathers of *Arianiſm*, or *Socinianiſm*, but only cenſured ſome of thoſe Arguments, by which they would eſtabliſh the Doctrine of a Trinity.

4. The Letter reports *Epiſcopius* ſuſpected of *Arianiſm*. p. 34, 35. he ſaith, *the Father is ſo firſt*, as to be firſt *in Order* (i. e. *in time.*)

Anſ.

Anſ. 1. *Epiſcopius* ſaith, the Father is firſt in Order, which we all grant: But it is the *Socinian* Comment, that makes the firſt in Order to be the firſt in time, which we deny. Becauſe though the Father is firſt in Order, yet the Son is Co-eternal with the Father, as before.

2. This Author denies a Co-ordination, and aſſerts a Subordination of Perſons in the Trinity: But this Subordination doth not deſtroy, but only Explains the Doctrine of a Trinity, as is noted already. And,

3. In his Inſtitut. *Theol.* l. 4. c. 32. He aſcribes a Divine Nature to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and teaches that they are all properly Perſons: And if this be *Arianiſm*, or *Socinianiſm*, we are all ſuch.

5. He Complements his dear Friend *Sandius* for a *Gentleman of Prodigious Induſtry, and Reading: and no leſs ingenious than Learned.*

Anſ. Whatever his Induſtry, and Learning was, I muſt deny both his Judgment and Honeſty.

1. His Judgment. For he knows not how to diſtinguiſh between the genuine, doubtful, and ſpurious Writings of the Antients; but thinks *Clemens* the Father of the Conſtitutions under his Name: Which is utterly impoſſible, becauſe *l.* 7. *c.* 48. the Author mentions three Biſhops of *Jeruſalem* made by the Apoſtles; *James*, *Simeon*, and *Judas*: But St. *John*, the laſt of the twelve Died, and this *Clemens* himſelf ſuffered Martyrdom in the year 100. while *Simeon* lived about ſeven years after: How then the Apoſtles could appoint *Judas* his Succeſſor, or *Clemens*, their Scribe Record it, neither their Learned *Sandius*, nor our *Socinians*, thoſe Men of Wit, and Reaſon, can reſolve me. They, as well as the Apoſtolic Canons, were probably written about the end of the Second Century, and ſeem to owe themſelves

(ex-

(excepting their Corruptions) to *Clemens* of *Alexandria*.

He receives likewiſe the Epiſtles aſcribed to *Ignatius*; and *de Vet. Script. Eccleſ.* he would prove the Legitimacy of that *ad Philip.* by this Argument, *viz.* *Origen*, who flouriſhed about the middle of the Third Age, hath ſomething upon St. *Luke*, like ſomething in that Epiſtle; where obſerve.

1. *Origen* doth not mention either *Ignatius*, or this Epiſtle.

2. *Ignatius*, and *Origen* might hit upon ſomewhat like Notions without Communication. And,

3. Theſe aſcribed Epiſtles are not mentioned by *Euſebius*, *Jerom*, or any other before them; whence we ought in all reaſon to reject them. Dr. *Peirſon*, late Biſhop of *Cheſter* obſerves, they appeared not till 400 years after *Ignatius*, whence he declares them ſpurious *Vind. Epiſt.* 8. *Ignat.* c. 10.

2. By ſuch intolerable Errors he creates difficulties to himſelf. For the deſign of his Hiſtory is to prove that all Antiquity is *Arian*: But the *Epiſ. ad Heron.* which is one of the aſcribed, ſaith, that if any aſſerts that Chriſt is ἄνθρωπον ψιλὸν, *a mere Man* (which phraſe was always uſed in oppoſition to his Divinity. *Iren. l.* 3. *c.* 26. and *Euſebius* in the caſe of *Ebion*) the ſame is *a Jew and a Murtherer of Chriſt.* Now had he like a Man of Art, and Judgment, rejected theſe Epiſtles, he had removed this Block, at which he muſt now ſtumble and fall.

2. I deny his Honeſty. For *Hiſt. l.* 1. *Secul.* 1. he will have the Creed called the Apoſtles, to be compoſed by them, to be the only Creed uſed in the Church; and that very Creed too, which was eſtabliſhed at *Nice*: And that *Evag. H. l.* 3. *c.* 17. ſaying, we are Baptized into a Creed compoſed by 318 Biſhops, intended no other but this: When this was never mentioned in that Council, and

and the Concert is totally Ruined by the Teſtimonies we have already produced upon this Argument, *Sect.* 4.

Should I draw out all the inſtances of weakneſs and knavery, I ſhould leave but little of that book behind me. A fit man for an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian, whoſe want of Judgment, and Honeſty makes his writings like a ſword in ſome mens hands, dangerous to them, that come in the reach of it. Sure I am, no Student ought to read him till he is well acquainted with the true ſtate, and doctrine of antiquity. His accounts of antiquity, and the brief hiſtory of the Socinians, may go together; and if each will be pretenders to wit, and reaſon, I matter not, ſo long as we have on our ſide better pretenſions to truth, and Honeſty.

Dr. *Wallis* in one of his letters gives an account of this *Sandius's* converſion, and his dying in the Trinitarian Faith. I earneſtly pray that the ſame Mercy,

and Goodneſs, would open the eyes of all *Arians* and *Socinians*, that they may no longer lye under ſtrong deluſions, and the belief of a Lye but may come to the knowledg of the truth, and be ſaved.

FINIS.

Books Printed for John Everingham *at the Star in* Ludgate-Street.

AN Enquiry into Several Remarkable texts of the old and new Testament, which contain some difficulty in them: with a probable Resolution of them, In two parts. *By John Edwards*, B. D. sometime Fellow of St. *John's* Colledge in *Cambridge*.

A new Discourse of Trade, wherein is Recommended several weighty Points relating to Companies of Merchants. The Act of Navigation, Naturalization of Strangers; and our Woollen Manufactures, the Ballance of Trade, and the nature of Plantations, and their Consequences in Relation to the Kingdom, are seriously Discussed. And some Proposals for erecting a Court of Merchants for determining Controversies, relating to Ma-

Maritime Affairs, and for a Law for Transferrance of Bills of Debts, are humbly Offered. By Sir *Josiah Child.*

Miscellaneous Essays: By Monsieur St. *Euremont*, Translated out of *French*, with a Character, by a Person of Honour here in *England*, continued by Mr. *Dryden.*

Monarchia Microcosmi: The Origin, Vicissitudes, and Period of Vital Government in Man. For a farther Discovery of Diseases, incident to Human Nature. By *Everard Maynwaringe*, M. D.